



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Thesis scanned from best copy available: may contain faint or blurred text, and/or cropped or missing pages.

**Schooling for boys and girls:
negotiating inclusion/exclusion**

Pauline Padfield

**Doctor of Philosophy
University of Edinburgh
2000**



A School for Boys and Girls

Jan Steen (1625/6 -1679) Dutch

National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh



Steen's painting of a pupil throwing a print of Erasmus on the floor, whilst another pupil offers a pair of spectacles to the owl of Minerva, suggests that a school's in/discipline arises from its pupils in/attentiveness. Steen asked, "What need a candle or glasses if the owl cannot and does not want to see?"

Abstract

The thesis presents a sociological examination of the problem of Exclusion from school. Over the last decade in the UK, a sharp rise in rates of Exclusion has resulted in official, professional and public concern about a relative 'failure' of Excluded youngsters to benefit from a 'broad and balanced' curriculum. As a case study, the thesis draws upon research conducted in two Scottish secondary state schools, to examine reported experiences of schooling among young people, aged 14 -15 years old, and their teachers. Exclusion, a sanction of 'last resort', represents a limitation of access to a key source of entitlement to welfare in modernity.

This thesis addresses Exclusion by presenting empirical material drawn from textual, observational and interview data. The thesis examines official and professional accounts of Exclusion, to find such accounts to be largely policy driven, positivistic in character, and failing to provide an explanation of the phenomenon. The thesis argues positivist accounts of Exclusions draw upon 'behavioural' approaches to in/discipline among pupils, which leads to normative typing or categorising of pupils as 'disaffected' and/or as 'troublemakers'. Policy makers rely uncritically upon essentialist understandings of gender to present disproportionate rates of Exclusion among boys relative to girls as partially down to 'natural' differences between the sexes. The thesis argues official and professional accounts of Exclusion are unable to provide a reflexive account of Exclusion due to the formal character of its categories, for example, action described in terms of 'behaviour' 'takes for granted' everyday rules of interaction.

The thesis argues explanation of Exclusion, and its gendered character lies in an analysis of everyday talk about talk/action among actors at school, to present schools and schooling as 'social institutions', in which meaning of action is negotiated according to actors normative understanding of everyday rules. Data show similar actions are judged differently according to the gender of the actor, an insight that offered analytical opportunities to examine the 'negotiated order' of gender relations at school. The thesis presents data to show 'reputations', created and used among pupils and teachers, reveal rules of everyday interaction at school. Analysis of pupil and teacher accounts shows informal relations among pupils, and formal relations between pupils and teacher are mutually constituted in talk. Data show talk about actors in terms of his/her reputation effectively leads to his/her normative labelling. The thesis presents data to show such labelling of pupils, particularly boys, may lead to discriminatory treatment of actors within informal and/or formal relations that constitute schooling. The thesis argues social and educational inclusion/exclusion at school is an outcome of on-going negotiation of everyday tensions within these mutually constituted sets of relations.

**I declare this thesis has been has been composed by myself on the basis of my own
research.**

Pauline Padfield

Acknowledgements

This thesis has emerged from interactions that most directly constituted my process of collecting original data, and my attempt to look at Exclusion and in/discipline in state secondary schooling from a fresh perspective. I thank pupils and teachers for their generosity and courage in speaking to me; it was fundamental to this thesis. I hope I heard and have represented them fairly. I thank Sheila Riddell and Janet Siltanen for help in preparing a proposal for submission to the ESRC. I am indebted to the ESRC for funding the first years of this research. I thank the Department of Sociology, at The University of Edinburgh, Sue Mawdsley and Bronwyn Robertson for providing a generous space in which to think and write throughout a period of considerable personal stress. I am fortunate in having had the best of teachers in particular, John Holmwood, whose theoretical vision of problem solving in social worlds illuminates my intellectual path. I thank my supervisors; Lynn Jamieson, for her patience and careful attention to detail in my written work and Pamela Munn, for her earlier engagement in this research, particularly with respect to my chapter about reputations at school. Alexandra Howson is acknowledged with heartfelt thanks for her critical and practical engagement with this sociological project. I also thank Mairi Ann Cullen, Julie Brownlie, Janet Ruiz and Tom Bryce for their interest in this work, and their friendship. I have enjoyed the best of intellectual 'neighbors' in Alex Law, Donald Hislop, Tom McGlew, Sarah Gore and Fiona Gill. I thank my 'peers', Sue Grundy, Akhil Pathak, Irene Rafanell, Bregham Dalgliesh, Suzanne Ottenheimer, and not least Sveta Klimova, for sharing friendship and ideas over food and wine. I thank Steve Kemp for his unfailing friendship. I thank Toby Morris and Veronica O'Malley and the computer support team, for their generous patience in my technological learning curve, without which this work could not exist. Friends have been patient and loving, I cannot thank them enough; Jane Roberts, Shelia Scott, Sheila Barker, Linda Johnson, Mary Matson, Nicky Glencross, Brian Crosbie, Louise Carroll, Carol McCulloch, Morag Holden, Judith Scott, Janet Dunlop and Frances Burgess. Margaret Macleod, Lena Bjork and children born to friends have brought me new joy during this lengthy process. My family, Joseph, Matthew, Gareth and Luke Padfield, their father Paul Padfield, my dear mother-in-law Cait Padfield, who sadly deceased before this thesis was completed, and my sister Anne Parker, have given me different kinds of love and support; thank you. Whilst this thesis represents these relations, I take responsibility for its claims.

For my father Ephraim, his sons Vincent and Robert
and Joe B

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vii
Prologue	1
Sociological perspectives on educational exclusion	2
Chapter One	7
The problem of Exclusion from School.....	7
Exclusion as event and process.....	7
Modernity schools and schooling	8
Modernity, social science and youth.....	15
Deviance revisited bad' pupils?	16
Young men, delinquency and subcultures.....	17
Questions of labelling.....	19
Education and gender	22
Official and professional accounting of Exclusion	27
an outcome of 'bad' behaviour at school	28
an event in a discursive process	33
principle of 'last resort'	35
outcomes for parents and children	37
an outcome of social difference	38
Explanations for the rise in the rates of Exclusion	43
Summary	45
Chapter Two	48
Theoretical resources for social inquiry into in/discipline at school	48
standing on the shoulders of giants	48
Individuality, individualism and moral individualism	48
Sociological understandings of identity	55
Interactionism	57
Social acceptance and 'self'	61
Limits of interactionism	62
Social constitution of rules	64
Transformations of gender in modernity	73
Psychological genesis of gender	75
Normative meanings in concepts of gender	77
'hegemonic' masculinity'	79
Men and 'masculinity'	81
Gender and schools	85
Summary	88

Chapter Three	90
Social inquiry and education	90
problems of sociological accounts	90
Introduction	90
Agency of young people	90
An issue of social competency	93
Loss of innocence	95
Methodological Tensions on social inquiry into education	96
Gender in research designs	101
Selection of pupils through the concept of sebd	103
Participants and their Schools	104
Type of child or type of experience	107
Strategies of support/control	108
Research Design: amended categories	111
Research Design: how many schools?	112
Methods of research	113
Interactive researching on intended/unintended consequences	116
Informed consent on being 'trapped at the back' of a classroom	120
Boundaries of trust on forgetting to turn on the microphone	122
Data analysis	123
Summary	124
Chapter Four	126
Social and educational inclusion/exclusion of pupils	126
Membership is more than attendance	126
Schools as social institutions	126
Teachers at school	130
Social worlds of schooling	133
Pupils at school	135
Boys 'in serious trouble' at school (SLG)	136
Girls in 'serious trouble' at school (SLG)	140
Boys 'in some trouble' (sheets)	144
Girls 'in some trouble' (sheets)	148
Boys 'not in trouble'	149
Girls 'not in trouble'	152
Implications for membership three different 'skivers'	156
Summary	159
Chapter Five	161
Reputations	161
'The purest treasure mortal times afford is a spotless reputation'	161
Introduction	161
Reputations at school	161

Discourses	165
Sticks and stones will break my bones and names will also hurt me	168
Informal Kinds of Reputations	172
Gendering of Reputations	178
Reflections on 'Gender Order'	180
Formal Kinds of Reputations	184
Teacher Reputations	189
Teachers good', 'bad' and 'indifferent'	190
Variable meanings of reputations	194
Summary	197
Chapter Six	200
Informal Relations at school	200
pals enemies and 'saddos'?	200
Introduction	200
Social audiences and networks	200
Gender and 'sticking up for yourself'	203
Social identity	205
Presentation of 'self' at school as 'performative action'	206
Gender and appearance	208
Levels of 'knowing' at school	210
Informal relations at school as 'communicative action'	212
definition of 'talking'	214
definition of 'fighting'	215
Boys fighting/ talking	216
Boys on girls as 'natural' communicators	219
Girls fighting/talking	219
Girls on boys as 'natural' performers	220
'Self' control is a gendered thing	222
Troubled pupil relations at school	225
definition of 'slagging'	225
Compulsory heterosexuality and sexual double standard	229
definition of 'stirring'	229
Summary	234
Chapter Seven	237
Classroom relations at school	237
"It takes two to tango"	237
Introduction	237
Pupils' perceptions of everyday life at school	237
Troubled interactions at school behaviour' or 'communicative action'	240

Problems 'in' and 'out' of class	242
definition of 'moaning'	245
Social boundaries at school	247
definition of 'grassing'	247
definition of 'radging'	249
Poor conditions for learning and teaching	251
'not my real teacher' temporary work	251
'not my real teacher', 'yuffy' work	252
Mrs Gregor's treatment of boys relative to girls	253
Atmosphere in class	258
Social and/or educational outcomes?	260
Order, order, order in classrooms	262
'gender order' in class	265
My 'real' teacher	267
a 'bad' teacher	271
Everyday pupil/teacher relations	272
Summary	275
Chapter Eight	278
Teachers' views on in/discipline at school	278
a wee stone can turn into a massive mountain	278
Introduction	278
Teaching and collegiality	278
Serious acts of in/discipline and gender	282
Social inequality and education	284
A teachers job is to teach	285
Teachers' notions of pupil 'maturity'	287
Definitions of in/discipline	288
Everyday problems in class	290
Teachers knowledge of pupils	292
Formal reports and potential litigation	293
Atmospheres in classrooms	294
Pupils 'in trouble' at school may 'act out' or 'be withdrawn'	296
Teachers' views on 'discipline'	298
Pupils 'deserving' and 'non-deserving' of support?	298
Whose job is it to 'discipline' 'problem pupils'?	300
Normative labelling at school	301
Stereotypical views of gender: alive and well	302
Teachers differential treatment of boys and girls	303
Norms of gender hegemonic' masculinity and 'mature' girls	305
Gender in/discipline or relational difficulties?	307
Contradictions: gender and schooling	308

Loss of face: illustrations of gender in action.....	310
'troublemaker' as total identity	310
Summary of gender findings.....	313
Summary	314
Epilogue	317
Exclusion, 'in trouble' and gender	317
Rationality, rules and negotiated order	320
Summary of Findings	319
Reputations	320
Pupils' social interactions.....	321
Resolving dis/agreements and gender	322
Teacher pupil interactions	323
Classroom interactions	323
Implications of the research.....	326
Bibliography	329
Appendix 1	347
Appendix 11	348
Appendix 111.....	349
Appendix 1V.....	354
Appendix V	356
Appendix V1.....	358
Appendix V11	363
Appendix V111.....	368
Appendix VX	372
Appendix X	373
Appendix X1.....	376

Prologue

A Scottish HMI report on alternative educational provision for 'pupils with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties' noted,

All regions stated that their professed policy towards pupils placed in alternative forms of educational provision was to reintegrate them as soon as possible... In practice reintegration did not always occur (HMI 1990).

One response to the report's observations was research carried out in two regions in Scotland into the practice and extent of reintegration into mainstream schooling of pupils officially defined as having 'behavioural, emotional and social difficulties' (Lloyd and Padfield 1995; Lloyd and Padfield 1996). Over a two year period, the study found that among pupils educated in alternative provision more boys relative to girls experienced exclusion from mainstream schools and very few pupils were reintegrated back into mainstream schools.¹ Some pupils were found to be lost from official records.

Research into reintegration called into question, i) the adequacy of official accounts of the phenomenon of 'pupils with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties'; ii) a muddled relation between re-integration into mainstream schools as a matter of educational entitlement, with exclusion from mainstream schools as rightful punishment for in/discipline at school; iii) its negative impact on boys relative to girls. The gendered character of the phenomenon called 'behavioural, emotional and social difficulties' (EBD) in England and Wales, and 'social emotional and behavioural difficulties' (sebd) in Scotland, is evident in official figures, which show a ratio of roughly 4 boys to 1 girl.² Little research had been carried out into processes of exclusion from mainstream schooling of pupils labelled as having 'behavioural, emotional and social difficulties'. Official accounts gave different

¹ Brodie (1998) notes research carried out by the Department for Education (DFE) showing low rates of reintegration of excluded pupils in England and Wales; only 27% of primary school children and 14 % of secondary school children are reintegrated into mainstream schooling (DFE 1995).

² See figures published in *Social Trends*, (1999: 58) that draw upon Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) figures. Table 3.7 Permanent exclusion from schools: by type of school and gender, 1996/97, shows a consistent gender imbalance across all levels and kinds of schooling, for example, 565 males were permanently excluded from Special schools in 1996/97 compared with 67 females.

reasons for concern about girls in comparison to boys, for example, girls were more likely to be defined in reference to issues of sexuality (DFE 1994). Academic and professional literature largely discussed 'pupils in difficulties' at school when in fact accounts were often derived from boys' experiences (Cooper 1993).

Sociological perspectives on educational exclusion

Subsequently, MSc research (Padfield 1995) carried out in 1995, identified a range of official labels constructed in response to organisational needs of educational administrators, which drew principally from practitioners' categorisations of children and partly from policy makers' accounts (Blyth and Milner 1996; Galloway *et al.* 1982). Tomlinson, and others, noted working class children, most often boys, (girls are not singled out for any specific mention at all) were likely to be labelled as 'maladjusted', 'disruptive', 'educationally backward' or simply 'dull' (Tomlinson 1982; Dockrell *et al.* 1978; HMI 1978; Tattum 1982: 35 -36). More recently the labels 'disruptive', 'disturbing' and 'disaffected' are applied to pupils (Lloyd 1992). In practice, assessment of children's educational needs drew upon official labels, which carried negative connotations that in effect socially constructed children as a 'type' of child. McPhee writes, "Assessment remains a 'hot' issue in the field of education, and among educational psychologists in particular. Despite the arguments set against traditional assessment over a long period of time ... for many teachers and workers dealing with difficult children the issues are not clear" (1992: 1). The MSc drew upon policy documents, to describe a continuum of educational provision, arguably according to his/her 'educational needs', offered to pupils in official trouble at school. The MSc tentatively argued that many pupils experience a continuum of exclusion, a view supported by more recent evidence (Social Trends 1999).³ Official responses to a pupil's act of in/discipline, defined as 'bad' behaviour, were shown as shaped according to whether or not a pupil's action was considered to be culpable, or beyond a young person's control. Within that process

³ See figures published in *Social Trends*, (1999: 58) which support this argument. Based upon Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) figures, Table 3.7 Permanent exclusion from schools: by type of school and gender, 1996/97, shows, in England, as a percentage of school population, 0.64 per cent of pupils in Special schools (which includes Local Education Authority (LEA) maintained, non-maintained and grant-maintained special schools) were permanently excluded from their Special school in comparison to 0.17 per cent of pupils permanently excluded from all schools (which includes primary and secondary Local Education Authority (LEA) maintained, non-maintained and grant-maintained schools) and Special schools.

pupils are officially labelled as having 'behavioural, emotional and social difficulties' for psychological and/or cognitive reasons, but, unofficially labelled as 'troublemakers'. These phenomena were shown to be linked in terms of educational outcome. Pupils defined as having 'behavioural, emotional and social difficulties' or, who were excluded more than once, were often educated in alternative forms of education, for example, in special schools.⁴ The MSc argued that two significant forms of exclusion, social and educational, existed at school.

This thesis explores these forms of exclusion, through its description and analysis of participants reported experiences of state secondary schooling in Scotland, to offer a sociological account of processes leading to Exclusion⁵ from mainstream school. People in everyday life often ask each other "what kind of work do you do?" In the last few years I have been asked that question many times. I have replied with a brief description of the problem the thesis seeks to explain. People without exception say "Oh, *that* is interesting?" Usually, this comment is followed by a moment of reflection and by way of response to my reference to 'in trouble', the respondent proceeds to tell a story. Stories are either about their own experience of being 'in trouble' at school, or, the teller may recall a memory of another person's experience of being 'in trouble'. All stories are linked by two common threads; the story is told with obvious feeling; the story refers to the use of reputations at school. A recent conversation with a young man who was painting woodwork in my house, illustrates this point. The painter's response to the description of my work was, "If you want to know about 'being in trouble' I'm your man, me and my brothers were famous in my school". He began to tell his story ... "Children can be so cruel to each other, like calling someone 'fatty' who was a bit overweight ... and they had to live with that all through their school days." The feelings people express are largely ones of current regret and/or pain as the teller recalls experiences of exclusion among peers and teachers at school. My belief in the relevance and worth of working for this thesis is continually restored by such conversations. The thesis, presented in

⁴ The achievement of public education's stated aims and purposes (SOEID 1998) relies upon mainstream provision, which by definition is not available to pupils in alternative educational provision. See Munn, Lloyd and Cullen, *Alternatives to Exclusion from School*, (2000:111-128) for a more recent account of debates regarding alternative educational provision for Excluded pupils and problems associated with defining 'effective' schooling.

⁵ From this point I use the capital E when referring to Exclusions to emphasise the fact that it is an outcome of an official process, and an event recorded by a school in a pupil's record.

eight chapters, explores the social construction of official labels associated with 'bad' behaviour, and the negative effects of labelling pupils, particularly boys, in such terms. This thesis presents data in two forms, based upon a consistent set of notation conventions⁶ that are adapted to facilitate the flow of accounts, which include observational comments and direct quotation from participants. The thesis has included some bibliographic references in footnotes of authors that the thesis has not directly consulted, but which may be of further interest to the reader.

Chapter One criticises concepts central to two related phenomena, 'social emotional and behavioural difficulties' and exclusion from school; 'behavioural difficulties' and 'disaffection'. Officials, professionals and academics use these concepts to help describe gendered experiences of and educational outcomes for pupils who cannot or will not co-operate with the formal demands of compulsory education in the UK. In such accounts, the gendered character of Exclusion is noted, but, explained as an outcome of boys 'natural tendency' to aggressive 'behaviour'. The chapter rejects these concepts as positivist and 'taken for granted', as leading to non-reflexive accounts of sebd and exclusion that cannot explain their gendered character. The chapter examines and treats as data a limited number of official circulars referring to organisation and practices related to Exclusion, to show schools and schooling are 'negotiated orders'. Official circulars reflect the discursive character of schools and schooling, which emerge as discursively produced within a network of 'school relations'. The chapter locates pupil action within 'school relations', to argue 'behavioural difficulties' and 'disaffection' are normative labels used to organise provision for pupils whose actions do not conform with teachers' normative understandings of the 'ideal pupil' (Becker 1952).

Chapter Two outlines functionalist explanations of social organisation, largely because official, professional and everyday accounts of Exclusion draw upon positivist categories to explain Exclusion in essentialist terms, as examples of 'deviance' by 'deviant actors'. The chapter outlines the impact of interactionism upon social theory, its theoretical power in illuminating 'intersubjectivity' to argue that everyday relations at school constitute a 'negotiated order', in and through rule-making and rule-following among gendered actors. The chapter examines sociology's quest to find a robust conception of gender that does not rely upon

⁶ See Appendix Ten for the conventions.

essentialist understandings of 'masculinity' and 'femininity'. Social theorists posit 'masculinities' and 'femininities' as concepts that accommodate the empirical experiences of actual men and women. Data show that 'masculinity' and 'femininity' among actors at school continue to be understood in essentialist ways. The chapter argues that descriptors attached to essentialist understandings of gender as 'being', act as normative referents in everyday negotiation of gender as 'doing', among boys and girls and teachers at school.

Chapter Three considers methodological and epistemological implications of rejecting 'positivist' and 'behaviourist' approaches to researching the problem, 'why do more boys than girls experience Exclusion from schooling?' Acknowledging current political and cultural shifts in the treatment of children as having rights and obligations associated with being competent to act as 'discursive subjects' in late modernity, the chapter describes and defends the research design, analytic categories and choice of methods as competent to address the research problem.

Chapter Four presents school as a social institution. The chapter briefly examines teachers' professional obligations in state comprehensive schooling, secondary pupils' entitlement to guidance at school and introduces pupils who directly participated in this research. Social inclusion/exclusion is conceptualised as an outcome of pupils' negotiation of everyday 'school relations'.

Chapter Five presents and explores different kinds of reputations used at school and argues that reputations are discursively and reflexively produced among pupils in everyday talk about others talk/action. Pupils assign reputations to pupils and teachers by referring to an individual in terms of a reputation. Reputations are argued to be central to understanding processes of inclusion/exclusion. Pupils' descriptions of the meaning and use of reputations show them to be normative statements about others at school, for example, 'slapper' and 'poof' are gendered pejorative reputations. Pupils know and refer to teachers by reputation, which reflect pupils' views of a teacher's personal status, professional attributes and capabilities.

Chapter Six presents data to show ways that pupils present themselves to and interact with others at school. Successful relations at school, in the first instance, require actors to 'perform', but, actors *also* require to 'communicate' competently in giving and accepting due recognition within the collective. The chapter presents

data to show a sense of 'self' and social acceptance as discursively produced in everyday interaction at school. Pupils' accounts reveal gender stereotypes, for example, of boys as 'fighters' and girls as 'talkers' reflect normative rules of interaction among pupils and teachers.

Chapter Seven attempts to make links between informal and formal relations among pupils and their teachers to argue schooling is dialectically constituted at the level of these relations. Whilst social relations, defined as 'gender relations', are necessarily constrained within formal relations, educational experience and its outcomes are significantly shaped by the character of social relations in class. Formally defined in accordance with the educational aims and codes of conduct, classroom relations are shown to range from co-ercive to co-operative, depending upon the social resources created among actors as they engage in the formal task of teaching and learning.

Chapter Eight draws upon teachers' accounts to present teachers' views on teachers and teaching as a professional enterprise, which relies very heavily upon pupils' acceptance of the formal aims and purposes of schooling. Teachers' accounts show that explanations of pupil in/discipline at school draw upon essentialist understandings of gender; for example, boys are argued to be less capable of acting as 'maturely' as girls of the same age. The chapter presents data to show the contradictions within teachers' accounts of gender in relation to Exclusion and in/discipline more generally.

Chapter One

The problem of Exclusion from School

Exclusion as event and process

Introduction

This thesis draws largely upon views of pupils from two Scottish secondary schools, Town School and City School, to identify ways in which pupils are socially constructed as 'troublemakers'. Public and professional debates about recorded rates of Exclusion of pupils labelled as 'troublemakers' have led to renewed policy interest in Exclusion. Schools and schooling are located within an historical context, which gave rise to 'school relations' in which parents and state are bound within a legal relation of mutual obligation with regard to the education of children. This chapter critically engages with the concept of 'behavioural difficulties' variously termed as 'behaviours', offers a brief examination of a phenomenon called 'social emotional and behavioural difficulties' (sebd) in Scotland and 'emotional and behavioural difficulties' (EBD) in England and Wales to show its close association with Exclusion (DFE 1994a).⁷ Discussion then shifts to 'deviance' and its traditionally essentialist approach to 'youth'. The chapter draws upon labelling theory to transcend positivist individualism of traditional approaches to 'youth' as 'trouble'. The chapter presents an account of Exclusion, through a brief analysis of official government circulars relevant to Exclusion. Treated as data, the chapter draws upon official and professional literature to show its discursive character. Finally the chapter briefly considers educational dilemmas and sociological implications raised by pupils' experiences of Exclusion, to argue that schools and schooling constitute a 'negotiated order'. Theoretical limitations in understandings of problems of order at school lead to the labelling of pupils as 'disaffected'; such pupils are Excluded and/or transferred to special schools. Labelling of a pupil at school, either negatively or positively, reflects an outcome of his/her negotiation of 'school relations' and schooling.

⁷ See Depart for Education and Employment (July 1999) *Social Inclusion: Pupil Support*, Circular 10/99, which replaces circulars contained in 'Pupils with Problems'.

Modernity, schools and schooling

The social origins of state schools and schooling as a modernist project, are reflected in the fact that the law obliges children 'to clock into school' according to the bell, which marks the time and duration of lessons (Paterson 1989). As a mark of citizenship and an unfolding of democracy, state education was presented to the population in terms of 'equality of opportunity' (Strong 1918), a principle that justified the compulsory character of mass education.⁸ Secured by the State in England and Wales through the Education Act of 1870, and in Scotland the Education Act of 1872 (McPherson and Raab 1988),⁹ legislators considered education as a form of social and moral control.¹⁰ State education's compulsory character draws attention to networks of necessary formal relations between parents, state and designated providers of education, which this thesis refers to as 'school relations'. Teachers, for example, as they carry out their professional obligations in relations with pupils, act in *loco parentis*. Durkheim writes,

An essential element that enters into any notion of a 'political' group is the opposition between governing and governed, between authority and those subject to it (Durkheim 1972 [1950]).

Durkheim's differentiation between 'governing' and 'governed' and the location of authority with the 'governing', distinguish between the state as an institution located in government, and education as a institution located within 'civil society'. Scottish education, for example, has traditionally been an important and valued aspect of Scottish civil society and its claim to distinctiveness. State funded education was expected to accomplish two social benefits within 'civil society'. First, education was expected to offer a measure of social control with respect to the

8 The central importance of education to social life, was underlined in Alfred Marshall's lecture of 1873, 'The future of the working classes.' which argued the one definitive right of children was to be educated a right of such significance for children and ultimately society that it should be secured though state compulsion (Marshall and Bottomore 1992: 4-7).

9The thesis acknowledges significant institutional distinctions between Scottish education and educational provision in the rest of the United Kingdom (Archer 1984; McPherson 1983).

10 In the Scottish context, Humes and Paterson cite George Lewis, (born in Glasgow, 1803) editor of the Scottish Guardian, "If the nation will not pay for the schoolmaster to prevent crime, it must pay tenfold for the repression of social disorder and for coercing an unhappy, dissolute and reckless population" (Patterson 1993: 69).

working classes, through a process of socialising or civilising working class children (Humes and Paterson 1983; McPherson 1992). Second, drawing upon liberal principles of 'self help', education in modernity as a welfare provision was expected to contribute towards progress in society and the amelioration of poverty (Paterson 1983). Schooling, it was argued, would be a positive benefit for children's loss of social liberty. Intervention by the state within traditional social provisions with respect to children created new forms of social problems, as provision of education according to egalitarian standards and its measurement of pupils as 'individual' beneficiaries of education, act in contradiction to each other (Young 1989: 10). This contradiction is reflected in public accounts of state education, as a persistent problem of inclusion/exclusion of children *within* state education and as an *outcome* of state education. Carlen refers to the outcome of truancy as a form of civil exclusion (Carlen et al. 1992). whilst an 'included child' is characterised by his/her personal acceptance of education and his/her social acceptance by others within education.

Historically, pupils have been socially organised into classes, taught a curriculum and been formally assessed according to a model of what a 'normal' child is expected to accomplish according to st/age.¹¹ The social organisation of children according to 'educational norms' arguably provides education and the state with a 'scientific' benchmark for assessing children according to 'academic ability' (Worsley 1978).¹² Compiled by teachers, a pupil's record is structured by three main formal categories, 'attendance', 'behaviour' and 'attainment', which in effect constitute state education's normative standards. A pupil's record, regularly presented to parents/guardians, is a concrete sign of the formal obligation between parents and state. State education, organised according to a model of the 'normal' child, aims to

11 The convention 'st/age', refers to the social organisation of pupils in state schools into class groupings according to age. Teachers teach a curriculum, to a class, which is designed and 'delivered' in accordance with professional expectations of pupils having reached a level of cognitive development thought to be age related.

12 The problem of measuring 'intelligence' is salient in so far as one of its uses has been to justify provision of qualitatively different kinds of education, to the detriment of 'working class' children in a mass education system (McPherson 1983). For a range of early sociological analyses and critique of the validity and reliability of IQ. testing in education, see P. Worsley *et al.* (1978) 2nd ed. *Modern Sociology*, England: Penguin Books.

provide a 'broad and balanced curriculum' so that all pupils 'achieve'; but it has had difficulty in accommodating children who are unable or do not want to learn. Pupils' inability and/or unwillingness to conform with formal codes of conduct and/or curriculum demands, is expected to be noted in a pupil's record,¹³ which provide evidence of tensions within 'school relations'. Extreme examples of such tensions are reflected in the problem of sebd/EBD, arguably resolved by reference to a pupil's psychological and/or cognitive profile.

In practice, schooling emerges at the level of interaction between teachers and pupils, and among pupils, formally governed by reference to codes of conduct, which act as guides to 'behaviour' expected to achieve 'institutional order' within schools. Schooling is constituted by two social orders, 'institutional' and 'informal' orders (Rosser and Harré 1976). Pupils deemed to reject formal rules and/or social norms of schooling, by definition, are not acting 'normally' and become known, for example, as having 'behavioural difficulties' or as 'disaffected'. Typically such pupils have been placed in 'special schools', for pupils with 'social, emotional and behavioural difficulties' or offered alternative forms of education (Munn *et al.* 2000).

Youngsters 'in trouble' at school

In Scotland, children 'in serious trouble' in the education system, or who come to the attention of the criminal justice and welfare systems, are typically referred to the Children's Hearings system, colloquially called the 'panel'. The Children's Hearings system emerged from the deliberations of the Kilbrandon committee and the publication of its report in 1964. Kilbrandon and his colleagues, approached children 'in trouble', as children 'with educational difficulties', and with a desire to reject a narrow crime and punishment approach to dealing with children whose lives were negatively characterised by circumstances beyond their control. The

13 For an important sociological discussion on the relationship between event and the record of that event in official record keeping, see introductory discussion in Raffel (1979) who notes methodological problems associated with taking 'written records' as a true statement of an event. Raffel quotes Cicourel, "Historical and contemporary non-scientific materials contain built-in biases and the researcher generally has no access to the setting in which they were produced; the meanings intended by the producer of a document and the cultural circumstances surrounding its assembly are not always subject to manipulation and control." (Raffel 1979: 9). In the chapters that follow, it is precisely such links that the thesis is concerned to illuminate.

Kilbrandon Committee took the view that drawing a distinction between a *potential* and an *actual* offender was arbitrary and artificial, concluding both groups suffered the same failures of upbringing and have similar needs for special educational measures. The salience of this report for this thesis is its explicit requirement of a reflexive account in its intention to promote,

...the application of an educative principle which cannot hope to operate with any measure of success except under a procedure which from the outset seeks to establish the individual child's needs in the light of the fullest possible information as to his circumstances, personal and environmental (HMSO 1995: 39)

Formal links between The Children's Hearing System and education is through a key reason for referral; "... that the child has failed to attend school regularly without reasonable excuse" (Schaffer 1992: 76).

In Scotland, government enquiries into truancy and in/discipline¹⁴ in schools led to the publication of the Pack Report (SED 1977). Further research, published in an HMI Report (HMI 1978), looked at the education of children with 'learning' difficulties. Taking a broad view of 'learning' difficulties the HMI claimed that up to 50% of the total school population had learning difficulties. One of the main causes of pupils' 'learning' difficulties was the curriculum and how it was presented. In England and Wales, a government committee set up to consider special education, produced the 1978 Warnock Report, which noted one in five children were recognised as experiencing 'learning' difficulties in the education system at some point in their schooling. These reports, concerned to understand why children were not able to benefit from schooling, a fact frequently manifested in 'bad' behaviour, gave rise to the concept of 'special educational needs' (SEN).¹⁵ Introduction of SEN in Scotland signalled a radical departure from 'child deficit' models that formerly explained a child's inability to learn. Warnock and HM Inspectors reports of 1978

14 Drawing upon Durkheim's argument, which relates *anomie* and the normality of 'deviance' in modern society, the form 'in/discipline' is adopted to stress that whenever action is discussed under the rubric of 'discipline' implicitly a speaker is making reference to a rule.

15 For a discussion of SEN principle, see Warnock (1978); HM Progress Report (1978). See also, Riddell and Brown (1994) *Special Educational Needs Policy in the 1990's* Warnock and the market place London and New York: Routledge.

considered the curriculum as a main source of pupils learning problems. Schools and their teachers were expected to solve pupils' 'learning difficulties' by reorganising a school's educational provision (Munn 1994).

Authors' across the UK debate the meaning and significance of the sebd/EBD labels, "Examination of the literature reveals a large number of definitions all of which carry value laden assumptions" (McPhee 1992: 1). The range of meanings implied by the labels sebd/EBD, reflect pupils' experiences of sebd/EBD as potentially complex social realities. Official definition of 'behavioural difficulties' reflects its ambiguity,

... emotional and behavioural difficulties lie on the continuum between behaviour which challenges teachers but is within normal, albeit unacceptable, bounds and that which is indicative of serious mental illness. The distinction between normal but stressed behaviour, emotional and behavioural difficulties, and behaviour arising from mental illness is important because each needs to be treated differently (DFE 1994a: 2).

By definition children labelled as having sebd/EBD are 'abnormal'. Formal recognition of Warnock's recommendations, contained in the Education Legislation of the 1980's, led to educational provision for children defined as having SEN, in terms of the precise nature of an individual's 'learning difficulty'.¹⁶ Warnock explicitly condemned the practice of labelling children, however, education legislation of the 1980's used 'old labels' as categories to aid organisation and administration of alternative education provision for 'pupils with difficulties'.

In practice, not all pupils with 'special educational needs' are formally assessed, a process documented in a Record of Needs (called a Statements of Needs in England

16 For a critical account of professions that emerged as a response to the problem of what to do with children who, arguably for social reasons, did not 'fit' into 'normal' educational provision, see Sally Tomlinson (1982) *A Sociology of Special Education*. Tomlinson's critical descriptions of the use and abuse of labels, for example Educational Sub-normal (ESN), show how such labels were disproportionately 'applied' to black children to justify Excluding black pupils from mainstream school. See also, L. Barton (1986) 'The politics of special educational needs', *Disability Handicap And Society*, 1, 3: 273-290.

and Wales), which facilitates the monitoring of the pupil's ongoing 'learning difficulties' (Thompson *et al.* 1996).¹⁷ However,

The permanent exclusion rate for pupils with statements of SEN, 1.1%, was eight times as high as that for pupils without statements, 0.14%, in 1996/97 (DFEE 30 September 1998: 3).

Any recommendations flowing from assessment, for example, extra professional and/or material resources to meet their educational needs, have statutory force and may have financial implications for a local authority or school. Although they may not have a Record of Needs, pupils with sebd/EBD are officially considered to come under the rubric of the SEN in terms of assessment, access to resources, and appropriate curriculum.¹⁸ Among this population a "... worrying proportion of children suffer lengthy gaps in their schooling prior to admission to residential school" (Circular No 9/94). Authors note interpretive problems entailed in assessing the nature and character of a pupil's difficulties (Thompson *et al.* 1996).

Tomlinson (1982) argues for caution; making links between theory and practice of SEN is not straightforward, as exemplified by experiences of pupils with 'behavioural difficulties'. 'Pupils with Problems', drawn from The Elton report into discipline in schools (Elton 1989) states,

There is no absolute definition of EBD. Children with emotional and behavioural difficulties have special educational needs. In terms of the legislation, they have 'learning difficulties' because they are facing barriers which cause them to have significantly greater difficulty in learning than most of their peers. Some children's learning difficulties will have caused or aggravated their emotional and behavioural difficulties, often accompanied by a *significant loss of self-esteem*. Other children's emotional and behavioural difficulties may have given rise to their learning difficulties, by impeding access to the curriculum through for example, the aggression, depression, or hyperactivity they have displayed. Some children may be bright but frustrated or suffering from some serious emotional disturbance (Circular 9/94: 4, *my italics*).

17 A formal category, 'Non-recorded', reflects how some pupils with SEN do not **formally** receive the kind and extent of educational resources that a Recorded pupil may receive.

18 See in Appendix 1 for copies of Form SC1: Prim, Form SC1: Sec, and Form SC1: Spec, used by the SOEID (1998 -1999) to collect information as part of a yearly census of schools carried out by the Government Statistical Service.

Twentieth century educational policy, whilst stressing 'equality of opportunity' in educational provision, has recommended 'special' and in practice, often educationally inferior provision.

Alternative educational provision is not always a solution to pupils' difficulties as high rates of Exclusion from special schools indicate. In Scotland, of the total numbers of pupils in special schools at September 1993 (10,077), pupils with social and emotional difficulties made up 1,657, or 16.4% of the special school population (SOED 1995b: 5). Official recognition of poor curriculum opportunities open to pupils is a cause of official concern, and attempts to assess pupils who manifest 'behavioural difficulties' raise professional, practical and moral dilemmas (McPhee 1992; Blyth and Milner 1996: xi - xv). Despite the conceptual challenge of SEN upon the practice of formal labelling in education, informally labelling of pupils in socially negative ways continues.¹⁹

sebd/EBD - 'behavioural difficulties' - Exclusion

Official and professional concerns regarding pupils with 'behavioural difficulties' point to a general debate about integration/segregation, which reveals a particular example of a general problem encountered by teachers who, in the **same time and place**, try to teach pupils according to 'normative' standards, whilst meeting the educational needs of a child whose learning capacities do not match those normative standards. Sometimes a child does not want to learn.

A blurred relationship exists between the phenomena sebd/EBD and Exclusion, linked by the ambiguous concept 'behavioural difficulties' and a likelihood of being educated out of mainstream schools (Cullen and Lloyd 1996). Pupils with SEN that arise from more obvious physical or cognitive difficulties have been educated **outside** mainstream schools, thus a main thrust of debate for SEN pupils has been

¹⁹ See Cullen, M. A. and Lloyd, G. (1996) *Alternative Education Provision for Excluded Pupils*, for a detailed review of literature which includes literature referring to pupils with sebd/EBD. Chapter Five directly addresses how labelling comes about within everyday social processes that constitute the experience of schooling.

about attending mainstream schools.²⁰ Pupils defined as having 'behavioural difficulties', who act in ways that are qualitatively different to 'normal naughtiness' (DFE 1994a:1) may be educated in small groups **outside** the mainstream classroom, but **within** a mainstream school. Some of these pupils may be transferred (not Excluded in the formal sense but in effect socially excluded from mainstream schooling) **outside** mainstream schools to special educational provision for pupils defined as having sebd/EBD (Booth 1996). When discussing practical implications of principles for integration, it is important to keep in mind that pupils with 'behavioural difficulties' are initially located **in** mainstream school. An effect of being labelled in terms of 'behavioural difficulties' is to **exclude** them from the classroom. Thus, for pupils with 'behavioural difficulties' the **trajectory is out of mainstream provision**. Effectively, attendance at alternative educational provision excludes children from a potential breadth and balance of mainstream schooling, an *opportunity to be presented for public examinations* and thus possibilities for attaining academic credentials. As an unintended outcome, alternative education or special education limits pupils' opportunities to participate fully in adult life. The chapter now turns to theoretical considerations of 'trouble', which in relation to 'youth' has largely been analysed through the concept of 'deviance'.

Modernity, social science and youth

Some sociological treatments of 'youth' in modernity have drawn upon functionalism to represent 'youth' as a potential source of social disorder. Brake (1980) traces this tradition to Socrates as evidence of the longevity of a tendency among adults to 'group' youngsters and proceed to label the 'group' largely in negative ways. Brake writes,

Young people have always suffered from the envious criticism of their elders. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the vast amount of writing, both of a scholarly and popular kind, that has been generated about the organization of their social life ... [defined] as a social problem ... with the adolescent working-class male, especially, being portrayed as a 'folk devil' (1980: 1).

Emler and Reicher (1995) draw upon Aristotle to make the same point, arguing mass schooling was expected,

²⁰ See Pijl, S. and Meijer C. (1991) 'Does integration count for much? An analysis of the practices of integration in eight countries, *European Journal of Special Educational Needs* 6: 2.; Booth, T. and Swann, W. (eds) (1992) *Policies for Diversity in Education*, London: Routledge.

... to bring higher standards and the possibility of advancement ... the liberal ideology of education depended upon the idea that youth was at risk, vulnerable and in need of constant and careful adult supervision ... youth were a social category who had the potential of getting out of control (1995: 23).

Modernity, characterised as a time of rapid *social* change, created conditions of adolescence as a time of rapid *emotional* change in which children and young people are targeted as consumers of all manner of 'commodities'. In its broadest sense, as challenge to mainstream rules and social norms, 'deviance' is closely associated with 'youth' as inherently *anomic* (Downes and Rock 1998). Authors have used 'deviance' in conjunction with interactionism in attempts to transform theoretical and empirical approaches to children 'in trouble' at school (Hargreaves *et al.* 1975; Tattum 1982).²¹ Capitalism's 'youth' is synonymous with 'delinquency', for example, Willis's 'lads' continue to hold centre stage (Furlong and Cartmel 1997; Ghail 1996; Shaw 1995; Willis 1977). Feminist scholarship challenged the absence of girls from this discourse (McRobbie 1991; McRobbie and McCabe 1981).²² Tomlinson's arguably more insidious account of black youth in the area of Special Educational Needs (SEN) showed how the category 'educational subnormal' was used to transfer black males out of mainstream schools (Tomlinson 1982). More recently, theoretical and material exclusion of black youth continues to be addressed (Ghail 1988; Ghail 1996). Ultimately, 'youth' has been well analysed in terms of materialist analyses of the transition from school to paid employment, and/or, as 'juvenile delinquents'.

Deviance revisited: 'bad' pupils?

This section provides a brief overview of the concept of 'deviance' and outlines labelling theory's contribution to undermining essentialist understandings of deviance and deviancy. Downes and Rock argue for the scope of deviance to

21 I come back to the work of these authors in later chapters.

22 Feminist critique of this empirical neglect, for example McRobbie's UK perspective on girls and 'deviancy', that argued girls form 'bedroom subcultures' (McRobbie and McCabe 1981). Later work by McRobbie (1991) researched some experiences of teenage mothers, whose use of pregnancy arguably reflected a discrete response to unemployment thus constituting a new social category.

address problems of societal exclusion generally, but in particular with regard to schooling. Exclusion from school, is described as,

... a field far wider than crime and necessitating the use of 'deviance' to capture its reach ... school exclusions in Britain have risen even more rapidly than crime rates or penal measures, and combined long-term effects with lack of substantive rights regarding the process (Downes and Rock 1998: 372).

At the level of common-sense, deviance has been understood as an attribute of a person, a view that shaped social science studies of deviance. Critical sociology challenged this view and deviance was redefined as a property of social situations (Becker 1963). My thesis argues that the former view dominates accounts of 'trouble' in schools, evident in official and professional focus upon pupils, especially boys, who are formally labelled as 'disaffected' and/or as 'troublemaker'. Downes and Rock conclusion that " ... deviance is intimately connected with the exercise of power and the application of rules (1998: 7) suggests a different approach.

Young men, delinquency and subcultures

Durkheim's central explanatory concept of *anomie*, the notion of a state of normlessness as arising in times of rapid social change, was adopted by social scientists to focus upon the activities of young males who largely came from disadvantaged backgrounds. Young men were labelled as criminal and referred to legally as 'juvenile delinquents'. The term is synonymous with the view that youth, largely meaning young men, can be *expected* to engage in challenging behaviour from within gangs or 'subcultures'.²³ The old saying 'boys will be boys' springs to mind. In association with 'subcultural theories',²⁴ and as an essential attribute of

23 See Downes and Rock (1995) for a comprehensive review of earlier urban sociological analyses of young men's experiences in the USA and the UK through the concepts of 'deviance' and 'delinquency', in which authors define social actors as deviant rule breakers who organised socially to offer collective 'resistance' to a dominant culture. Downes and Rock discuss and critique subcultural theory and 'delinquency' as failing to offer a sociological explanation of young men's experiences of social deprivation (1998: 175 -181).

24 Connell's important review of the wide range of sociological studies carried out from the University of Birmingham's Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, rightly pointed out 'deviance', 'delinquency' and 'youth culture' were concepts upon which researchers hung a very heavy explanatory and methodological weight (Connell 1983: 229-230).

disadvantaged male youth, 'delinquency' is deeply implicit in social and academic commentary on disadvantaged male youth, especially among criminologists.

Drawing upon 'individualism', sociologists have defined 'deviancy' and sought solutions to problems of 'behaviour' defined as deviant, from a range of social science perspectives. Individualism views the *individual defined as deviant* as the appropriate point to begin inquiry into 'abnormal' behaviour. Informed by Parsonian functionalism, which views deviancy as an example of system failure in relation to the socialisation of an individual into the shared norms and values of the system, people defined as deviant have been closely associated with criminality and/or mental illness. In the study of 'troublesome' people the label 'psychopath' reflected accepted notions of individual pathology that characterised approaches to knowledge in these fields. Deviance by definition is thus associated with 'pathology' and 'abnormality' and 'behaviours' argued to threaten social integration.²⁵ This perspective makes no distinction between the 'person' and 'action' as a legitimate response to social conditions. Functionalist definitions of 'deviance' reflect a 'type of person' (criminal) as evidenced by socially inappropriate 'behaviours' (criminal activity, for example, certain kinds of drug taking). Evidence of deviant 'behaviours' earn for the individual a socially negative 'identity', a deviant identity, which a 'positivist monologue' and 'individualism' explain as having an inherent attribute of deviance.²⁶ Positivist explanations, which treat deviance as pathology, have traditionally been drawn upon to justify control of 'disruptive' youngsters through use of sanctions and punishment (Braithwaite 1989).²⁷ Individualism premised on

25 See Durkheim's discussion regarding positivistic approaches to establishing categories of social facts, in which he distinguished between categories and human action, "It is true that the average type cannot be determined with the same degree of clarity as an individual type, since its constituent attributes are not absolutely fixed but are likely to vary" (Giddens 1972: 103).

26 See Chapter Two for a theoretical treatment of the concepts, 'positivist monologue' and 'individualism'.

27 In sociology, early treatments of deviance considered it to be analogous with individual pathology. See Braithwaite (1989) for a comprehensive survey of the major intellectual contributions to the study of deviance, labelling theory and its evident impact in psychology, psychiatry, criminology and social science more generally.

essentialism allowed for conceptualisation of delinquent action as an individual problem, and a logical methodological focus on the individual.

In *The Rules of Sociological Method* (1895), Durkheim extended the notion of deviance as norm violation to include deviance in his explanation of how society works. Durkheim argues every society needs deviant actors. For Durkheim deviance is a socially necessary creative force, that 'crime is normal' because a society exempt from it is utterly impossible. Durkheim argues deviant action has a positive social affect in that the 'collectivity' is forced to consider the norms and rules that the action violates, and in so doing, are likely 'to unite against a common enemy'. From Durkheim's perspective deviance is action that maintains social cohesion within a society, through its challenge to everyday rules of interaction. In their chapter, "Metamorphosis of Deviance", Downes and Rock (1998: 363- 381) argue the relevance of Durkheim's concept of *anomie* and deviance for social research has been its illustration of the strong quality of ambiguity characteristic of human interaction. Study of deviance has noted the characteristic of ambiguity as evident in who or what is actually targeted as deviant,

Ambiguity does seem to be a crucial facet of rule-breaking. People are frequently undecided whether a particular episode is truly deviant or what true deviance is: their judgement depends on context, biography, and purpose (Downes and Rock 1998: 4).

Ambiguity about deviant action necessarily gives rise to discussion between rule enforcers and rule breakers, in which social norms and formulations of rules for specific social contexts are tested. By definition, acts of deviance provide social opportunity for negotiation of social norms, between and within collectivities, a social process through which social boundaries are created and maintained. The sociological importance of Durkheim's legacy is precisely a perspective from which to consider the problem of Exclusion; as Becker writes,

... deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an "offender". The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behaviour is behaviour that people so label (Becker 1964: 9).

A discussion about deviance from this perspective inevitably entails reference to social norms and rules argued to regulate conduct. The questions explored in the chapters that follow are, what is and how do social actors define 'normal' social action in schools?

Questions of labelling

Sociology of deviance drew upon the insights of labelling theory²⁸ as it offered a sustained critique of the kinds of questions generally asked about deviancy, either by a person in the street, or by social scientists whose scientific inquiry is shaped by functionalist positivism. Becker writes, those who seek an explanation for deviant behaviour from these perspectives ask the following questions.

What laymen want to know about deviants is: why do they do it? How can we account for their rule-breaking? What is there about them that leads them to do forbidden things? (Becker 1964: 3)

These questions assume,

... those who have broken a rule constitute a *homogeneous category*, because they have committed the same deviant act (Becker 1964: 3; *my italics*).

Assumptions that inform a 'pathological' perspective ignore a central fact about deviance. As Becker writes,

[deviance] is created by society ... social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labelling them as outsiders (Becker 1964: 9).

Labelling theories questions' were relevant for this thesis, because they provided a way of transcending the form of official accounts of Exclusion, which 'type' and 'categorise' pupils in terms of 'behaviours', which had the effect of constraining analysis in terms of the individual. Labelling theory provided a wider perspective that allowed for an inclusion of social dimensions of action.

Sociologists who argue that deviance is best viewed as a formal property or quality of social situations ask different questions from individualism. Questions, for example, which establish **how** the label is constructed, who applies it and to what extent does it impact upon the person so labelled. In a *given context*, **what** does the label refer to, **how** is the application described, **who** is identified in the application process and to **what** extent does it impact upon the person assigned the deviant label. The latter is measurable in terms of degree to which the person is

²⁸ See Howard S. Becker (1963) for his classic statement of labelling theory in *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*, New York: The Free Press.

included/excluded from the context in which the norms were 'violated' by his/her deviant actions. Finally, does the person so labelled accept the label?

Labelling theory continued to have a significant impact upon the discipline of criminology and on social science more generally.²⁹ However, critical sociological explanations for deviance in society 'got lost' as its insights were used to find solutions to social problems through a focus on individuals who can be 'blamed'. Becker wrote,

The sociological study of deviance had an auspicious beginning, rooted in the central concerns of sociological theory. Problems of deviance were problems of general sociology... Unfortunately, the study of deviance lost its connection with the mainstream of sociological theory and research. It became a practical pursuit, devoted to helping *society* deal with those it found *troublesome* (my italics) (Becker 1964: 1).

Notions of essentialism closely associated with 'deviancy' continue as evidenced by the labelling of pupils as 'troublemakers'. Nevertheless, sociology of deviance notes a creative tension between control *and* conformity to criticise the notion of 'youth' as inherently deviant, and argues 'delinquency' evidently emerges as a solution to a problem, rather than as a problem to be solved.

Conventional notions of social structure as systematic constraint, were similarly called into question. Habermas's concept of 'communicative action'³⁰ and Lyotard's notion of society as a series of competing 'linguistic games' provide significant exemplars.³¹ Fundamental to 'communicative' and 'linguistic' approaches to social

29 Becker's sociology was central to critical debates of Sociology and sociologists as mouthpieces of the powerful. See also Alvin Gouldner's *For Sociology: Renewal and Critique in Sociology Today*, especially his essay, 'The Sociologist as Partisan: sociology and the welfare state.' These essays outline theoretical connections between methodology and policy debates. See Braithwaite, J., (1989) *Crime, shame and reintegration*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, for an overview of the labelling tradition in criminology. See also, Becker, H.S., (ed.) (1964) *The Other Side: Perspectives on Deviance*. New York and London, Free Press.

30 Habermas' view of interaction as a basic unit of social inquiry, is implicit in the thesis' focus upon relations among people at school (1989). His central concept 'communicative action' is described in Chapters Six, and drawn upon in subsequent presentation of data.

31 See the work of Lyotard, J. (1979) *The Postmodern Condition: A Report of Knowledge*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

explanation is the concept of social constructionism. Downes and Rock (1998) underline the rhetorical power and analytic potential for critical appraisal of knowledge about a) action defined as deviant, and b) methodological problems, which an emergent social constructionist perspective brings to the production of knowledge about 'social realities'. Deviance and deviancy continue as powerful concepts linking the study of rules and the study of all kinds of knowledge production, including knowledge about rules and social norms at school (Paterson 1989: 31 -54). Codified rules and regulations and social norms perceived as 'taken for granted', articulate how social relations ought *to be* acted out. In practice, how *are* 'school relations' acted out? Ultimately the concept of deviance points towards social constructionism, interactionism, and a discursive production of rules, regulations and social norms. In the chapters that follow, the impact of labelling children as an outcome of their negotiation of 'school relations' within the 'institutional' and 'social' orders that constitute schools and schooling as a 'negotiated order',³² is examined.

Education and gender

From its inception education provision was shaped by traditional attitudes and beliefs about girls *and* boys in terms of 'gendered roles' they would take up in adult lives. School architecture reflected the depths of generally held gendered views, for example, at Scotland Street School, a board school designed in 1900 by Charles Rennie Macintosh for the Glasgow Education Department, playground and entrances to the school were designed along gendered lines. In play girls and infants were separated from boys by tall railings *and* entered the 'institutional order' of schooling through different doors. Officials expected that girls would become wives and mothers, and boys would become husbands and breadwinners. Women teachers, for example, were barred from teaching once they married, a ban formally lifted in the UK in 1945. As a result of The Sex Discrimination Act (1975), the way was opened for women to participate fully in civic, political and social life. Absence of gendered distinctions between pupils in official documentation, hidden within ideas of 'natural' aspirations for girls and boys derived from their biological sex, has

32 Chapter Two explains the concept of 'negotiated order' in its treatment of rules.

been because gender differences were regarded as unproblematic.³³ A key social institution for transmission of beliefs and attitudes about 'being' a man or a woman is a 'school', characterised by its particular 'gender regime' (Connell 1987; Connell 1996: 213 -214).

A consistent theme of inclusion/exclusion is threaded through sociology of education, for example, in relation to the capacity of education to achieve social amelioration (Boudon 1974; Bourdieu and Passeron 1990b). Sociologists have variously described children's educational failure to attain 'promise to profit' in terms of 'intellectual ability', as a 'problem child' or as a result of being a member of a 'problem family', which led to provision of compensatory education for specific 'learning needs' (Ginsburg 1972). Sociological research into pupil-teacher experiences shows teachers draw upon social reasons to 'type' pupils in ways that have negative educational effects (Becker [1952] 1971; Coard 1971; Hargreaves *et al.* 1975). Becker's teacher concept of 'ideal pupil', connotes a normative appraisal of pupils. Keddie notes Becker's 'ideal pupil', arguing that it represents a social class judgement of pupils' social, moral and intellectual 'behaviour' (1971: 55).³⁴ More recently, Mac an Ghaill, on a teacher's criticism of a colleague who, " ... when black kids do bad on tests you blame them and when they do well you question the test" noted, "A systematic policy of stratification operated within the school through a strict streaming procedure" in which diagnostic tests were used for streaming purposes (Mac an Ghaill 1988: 78 -82). In conditions of limited resources, Mac an Ghaill argued teachers faced with the problem of too many pupils judged as equally 'academically able', solved problems of limited spaces by drawing upon racist understandings of Afro-Caribbean boys, to justify selection of some Afro-Caribbean boys out of classes by offering a curriculum appropriate to their academic needs.

Beliefs about what constitutes an appropriate curriculum for boys and girls continued to reflect traditional views about the social roles of men and women (Jamieson 1990). In Scotland, Bamford's review of research into gender in education,

33 See Stanworth (1981) for an early feminist criticism of the gendered character of education as reflected in its organisation and practice of schooling.

34 Keddie (1971) draws upon early work in schools by H.S. Becker (1952) 'Social class variations in the teacher-pupil relationship' in *Journal of Educational Sociology*. vol. 25: 451 - 465.

noted differences in education for boys and girls, and men and women, in learning style, subject choice, levels of attainment and in access to educational opportunities (Bamford 1988). Gendered patterns were identified across the whole range of educational experiences, from pre-school to continuing adult learning. Bamford argued that gender, as an important categorical variable in educational research, was not recognised due to the unexamined assumptions about the appropriateness of certain activities for one sex or another (Bamford 1988: 7). A Scottish Education Department's publication in 1971, stated education's gendered aims, "... to prepare girls and boys for very different lives" (Bamford 1988: 9). Women teachers' opportunities had been limited because they were identified as mothers or potential mothers. Bamford found, prior to her work, no Scottish research had been carried out into gender differences in subject preferences and learning styles, and went on to identify twelve areas where strategies for remedying the absence of gender, whether as a focus, or an aspect, of educational research, were required.

Scottish education's arguable claim to 'egalitarianism', rests upon the mythic 'lad o' pairs', whose official and public manipulation varies, not least to advance the spread of comprehensive education as a means of remedying educational provision through 'types of schools' for 'types of pupils' (Humes and Paterson 1983; McPherson 1983; McPherson 1990).³⁵ Leslie Hill's reflections upon twenty one years in Scottish Education, arguably a 'lass o' pairs' whose existence challenges 'mythic' accounts of Scottish education, described her experience as typical of what is called the "Senga Syndrome", the fate of working class Glasgow girls who despite a university education returns,

... if she has ever left, to live near and teach in her old school or very close to it (Paterson and Fewell 1990: 150).

Hill's education and working life spanned the period of equal opportunity legislation and her experience leads her to argue that despite legislation "... gender codes and behaviours are so institutionalised as to go unnoticed (Hills in Paterson

35 For an historical account of educational provision in Scotland, organised by 'type of pupil' assigned to a 'type of school' see (McPherson 1992). McPherson's sociological analysis draws upon critical historiography of traditional accounts of education in Scotland to argue the SED organised schooling according to social class and not, as claimed by Scottish Education Department (SED), according to 'academic ability'.

and Fewell 1990: 148). Hill's comments remain salient. Harriet Swan notes a continuing differential between the salaries of male and female academics, "An average female academic in a UK university will earn between four and five years less salary than an equivalent man working the same number of years between starting and retiring, according to Association of University Teachers general secretary David Triesman" (The THES: March 5, 1999).³⁶

A positive outcome of early feminist research and political demands, alerted educational researchers to 'gender blindness' within research agenda, and its limiting effects upon explaining girls' educational opportunities. McPherson notes, "By the end of the 1970s, girls were leaving school better qualified on average than boys, and they were close to achieving parity of entry to higher education despite the contraction of teacher training in that decade" (McPherson 1992: 99). In Scotland, research funded by the Equal Opportunities Commission (Turner *et al.* 1995) attempted to describe educational reforms, introduced by successive Conservative governments across 1980s and early 1990s, their outcomes and impact upon gender through an analysis of local education authorities policy documents.³⁷ Powney's more recent review of gender in relation to formal attainment shows that,

Gender differences in attainment persist at all levels of education but ... figures show some of the paradoxes in gender and attainment. Males gain most of the higher education top awards but the trend is for girls to do better in public examinations than boys - differences which are apparent in the earlier years of schooling (Powney 1996: 1).

Following twenty five years of formal equality for pupils in relation to the curriculum, Engender's Gender Audit (1998-99) provides statistical information showing a continuity of gender differences within subject choices.

Pupils now follow an undifferentiated curriculum, but learning materials contain examples of gender stereotyping. Connell writes, "To put it in more familiar language the 'hidden curriculum' of sexual politics is more powerful than the

³⁶ See, The Times Higher Education Supplement, March 5 1999, 'Call to get tough on sex bias': 3.

³⁷ For an overview of gender within Scottish Education, since recognition of its conceptual and empirical significance, see Riddell (1999) 'Gender and Scottish Education' in Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. (eds.) *Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

explicit curriculum (Connell 1993: 101). Boys and girls are expected to act differently in behaviour, dress, manners and to speak differently (Connell 1996: 210). Although the argument for 'equality of opportunity' for women and men is won in principle, the effect of stereotypical assumptions about women and men continues.³⁸ No argument is ever won, once and for all.

Boys relative *under achievement* to girls, is currently a topic of debate within a range of literatures. Weiner *et al.* write,

It appears as if female success is viewed as a corollary to male failure. Rather than celebrating girls' achievements and aspirations, we now have a discourse of male disadvantage in which boys are viewed as falling behind in academic performance (Weiner *et al.* 1998: 620).

Across a decade, circa 1988 to 1999, official accounts reflect gendered changes in academic 'attainment', but fail to explain an historic pattern of differences in gendered achievement (Epstein *et al.* 1998: 4-5). Delamont draws attention to historical illustrations of boys who underachieved in relation to school work to argue, " ... the subspecialism of sociology of education has, for a century, been ambivalent about the 'hooligan'. It has both celebrated and excoriated the anti-school working-class boy" (Delamont 2000: 95). Accounts of boys at school characteristically use labels or categories argued to represent different kinds of boys, for example, Connell's 'cool guys', 'swots' and 'wimps', but the labels refer to social or educational achievement (Connell 1993). Martino categorises boys as, 'cool boys', 'party animals', 'squids' and 'poofers', to argue actual boys define each other in reference to normative ideas about what constitutes a socially acceptable gendered 'self' (Martino 1999). Martino writes, Brian's masculinity "... is ... self-regulated in accordance with specific norms, which are organised around a devaluing of any association with girls or the 'feminine' (1999: 248).

38 Many feminist scholars argue for the on-going need for grounding the **intellectual** task of social inquiry with women's continued social inequality in mind. Margaret Stacey's address to the BSA, Equality of the Sexes Committee in 1982, reminded her audience that, " ... women have had to work their imaginations hard to think of ways in which, whether we want to have children or not, we can live without male domination and without oppressing other women (Finch 1993: 229). Stacey noted the inevitability of change, but argued the " ... form that it takes is not" (Stacey 1982: 48).

Feminist demands have transformed the provision of curriculum that no longer assumes *girls ought to take home economics*, and *boys ought to take technical subjects*. Authors argue education has nevertheless remained remarkably resilient in resisting deep structural change (Paterson and Fewell 1990). Although no longer reflecting an official sexist policy, segregation of boys and girls in schools has not disappeared; pupils continue to order themselves in gender segregated worlds (Goffman 1977; Thorne 1993, 1994). Attempts to move beyond a rhetoric of inclusion regarding gender, show a persistence of class inequality in education (Brown and Riddell 1992). Chapters Six and Seven examine and describe pupils' perceptions of their everyday lives at school as gendered social actors.

Official and professional accounting of Exclusion

Public accounts of Exclusion in Scotland do not present a reliable statement of *national* rates of Exclusion in Scotland. Analysis of relevant circulars, published by the Scottish Office,³⁹ shows a continuing definitional uncertainty about Exclusion (SOED 1993a; SOED 1993b; SOED 1995a; SOED 1995). Public accounts of education are based upon school census data collected from Scottish schools and local education authorities, broadly as numerical data. Educational law sets out mutual obligations and responsibilities between parents and state regarding children educated within state education, which gave rise to three main formal categories, attendance, attainment and behaviour (Rosser and Harré 1976: 177). At a macro level, aggregated knowledge about pupils, and/or the quality of their education are presented as a measure, for example, as positive or negative 'learning outcomes' presented in school examination league tables. Official and public accounts of education are presented in a *positivist form*. At a micro level, policy and professional problem solving constrained within this positivism, organises its account of those pupils who do not 'fit within' its general categories as 'problem pupils', officially labelled as having 'behavioural difficulties' or as 'disaffected'. Such accounts, 'individualise' or 'psychologise' pupils in terms of the problems they encounter (Mac an Ghaill 1994; Rattisani 1992).

39 The thesis refers to the Scottish Office as its process took place largely before the Scottish Office was renamed as the Scottish Executive after the establishment of the Parliament in 1999.

an outcome of 'bad' behaviour at school

Exclusion is an official response to pupil action defined as serious in/discipline or serious 'bad' behaviour that effectively disrupts general everyday process of learning and teaching in schools (DFE 1994b; HMI/Ofsted 1995/6; SOEID 1998). Put another way, Exclusion is used by a school in response to a pupil's serious failure to co-operate with rules and/or accepted social norms at school (SOEID 1998:1). Legal terminology referring to Exclusion differs in England and Wales from Scotland, as reflected in different names given to two kinds of Exclusion. A pupil may be not allowed into his/her school for a period of time, or may never be allowed back into his/her school. In England and Wales the former is called 'fixed term' and the latter 'permanent'. In Scotland, the former was called *temporary* and the latter *permanent*; new guidance to schools on these matters requested that schools note,

The term 'temporary exclusion' should be used when a pupil is excluded from a school but remains on the register of that school because it is expected that he or she will return when the period of exclusion is complete.

and,

The term 'permanent exclusion' should not be used; instead, when a pupil is excluded from a school and the pupil's name is removed from the school register, the term 'exclusion/removed from the register' should be used (SOEID 1998: 5).

These arrangements reflect Scottish official concern to monitor statistical information more carefully than has been the case in the past.

In the 1990's, National Exclusions Reporting System (NERS) figures show a steady increase in the number of recorded Exclusions in England and Wales (Brodie 1998:1). Brodie reports,

... an increase in the number of exclusions from 2,910 in 1990-1 to 3,833 in 1991-2. In 1993-4 ... the number of *permanent* exclusions had risen to over 11,000 a dramatic threefold increase. In 1995-6 the number of exclusions had risen again to reach a total of 12,500 and in 1997 the figure was 12,700. Although there is as yet no centrally collected data on the number of *fixed term* exclusions it has been estimated that some 135,000 of these take place each year (Brodie 1998: 1).

The Department for Education and Employment (DFEE) published figures that suggest the 11,084 pupils *permanently* Excluded in 1994-95 represented a tiny proportion (0.15%) of the school population (DFEE 21 November 1996). Of

particular concern within these figures is a reported rise in the number of primary school children. Brodie reports,

However, more younger pupils are also being excluded: in 1995-6 the number of exclusions taking place in primary schools increased by 18% from 1,400 to 1,600. An update of DFEE publications of figures for 1998 show that 12% of *permanent* Exclusions were of pupils from primary school, 83% from *secondary* school and 5% from special schools (Brodie 1988).

The reported upward trend in Exclusions fuelled public and professional debates about Exclusion, which led to changes in educational law in England and Wales. Legal changes tightened up the length of Exclusion, for example, Section 261 of the Education Act 1993, abolished the use of 'indefinite exclusion' replacing it with 'fixed term' which involved placing a limit of Exclusion to 15 school days, in any one term (TESS 30 September 1994). Legislation has undergone further change, most recently in the Education Act 1997 and the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, which further amended time limits of Exclusion, to 45 days in any one school year. Despite legislative changes the procedures set out in Circular 10/94 remained in place until July 1999 (DFE 1994b).⁴⁰ In England and Wales, after discussion with School governors, a decision to Exclude a pupil from school, remains the sole responsibility of the head teacher, and parents have a right of appeal against that decision.

A major study, *Exclusions from School and In-School Alternatives*, commissioned by the Scottish Office, reflected Scottish responses to concern about reported rises in numbers of Exclusions in the UK as a whole (Cullen *et al.* 1996a; Cullen *et al.* 1996b; Cullen *et al.* 1996c). Scottish research raised doubts about the validity of statistics on Exclusions in Scotland (Cullen *et al.* 1996a: 25-29). Scottish official accounts of Exclusion have only relatively recently been made available for public scrutiny. In a series of texts *Information for Parents*, public information on Exclusions indicate significant differences in rates of *permanent* Exclusion between education authorities (HMI 1997: 85-88). Published education authority returns to the SOED, on *permanent* Exclusions from secondary schools, read like a bizarre football score rate, for example, Aberdeen City 35, Dundee City 0, City of Edinburgh 0, West Lothian 7 (SOEID 1999: 85 -88). The SOEID explain the variation in the following way.

40 Changes to these arrangements are to be found in *Social Inclusion: Pupil Support*, Circular 10/99, issued in July 1999 as referred to above.

Some education authorities (returns) have zero for *permanent* exclusions because as a matter of policy they do not permit *permanent* exclusions or because they do not record permanent exclusions separately. In these cases some pupils may be excluded on a long term *temporary* basis (SOEID 1999: 85).

The category 'long term *temporary*' echoes the practice behind 'indefinite exclusion' formerly used in England and Wales, and points to a key negative aspect in the experience of Exclusion; a **long term** loss of schooling. Rates of Exclusion from special schools in Scotland do not appear in the text. Figures published by DFEE note a rise in recorded *permanent* Exclusion from special schools in England and Wales.

There were over 600 *permanent* exclusions from special schools in 1996/97, an increase of 21% in relation to the 500 permanent exclusions in the previous year (DFEE 30 September 1998).

Readers are explicitly advised, "comparisons between education authorities [figures] should be treated with great caution" (SOEID 1999: 85). This statement suggests public accounts of Exclusions in Scotland are not well founded in aggregate data collected from schools, either via the local education authority or directly from schools.

Theoretically, empirical links can be traced between pupil, teachers, educational authority and SOEID, via individual pupil records, but differences in education authorities' policies impact in different ways upon organisation and practices of recording Exclusions to prevent a comparison of *rates* of Exclusion between educational authorities. Cullen *et al.*, note a general acceptance of the principle of 'last resort' in cases of Exclusion,

Although there was general agreement amongst the education authority interviewees that their authority's policy stance emphasised the place of exclusion as a last resort, we found differences in how this was conveyed (Cullen *et al.* 1996a : 34).

Cullen *et al.* noted, "All Education Authorities ... routinely collected information on all exclusions - at least on all exclusions to which the schools were willing to record" (Cullen *et al.* 1996a: 25), which suggested a degree of scepticism among some education authority personnel regarding completeness of records kept on Exclusions. Research found that record keeping, largely in the form of Exclusion letters to parents, was principally influenced by concerns to provide evidence in potential cases of parents' appeal against their child's Exclusion. In a context of

definitional change and exhortation to schools "... to evaluate and review regularly their own school policy and practice on exclusion and school behaviour more widely" (SOED 1998: 15) the 'great caution' point is explicitly reiterated in 1999 (SOED 1999: 85).⁴¹ Scottish research raises doubts about the veracity of NERS statistical data on Exclusion, where similar practical issues apply.

A third report arising from *Exclusions from School and In-School Alternatives*, discusses case studies carried out in Scottish Schools, to argue for a more subtle approach to understanding the use of Exclusion (Cullen *et al.* 1996b). Scottish research used the idea of a continuum of inclusion/exclusion as a framework to assess schools stated views on its use of Exclusion (See Cullen *et al.* 1996c: v-viii). Drawing upon Martin and Wilcox (1985) and Lloyd-Smith (1993) the research focused on the role of the schools in Exclusion. The report states,

The argument that differences in exclusion rates between schools is too great to be explained solely by differences in the socio-economic characteristics of pupils is well known (Cullen *et al.* 1996c),

a view that echoes McLean's earlier research (See below). From a range of important findings,⁴² a key finding pointed to differences in the nature and character of relationships at school.

Poor interpersonal skills evinced by pupils and/or teachers, compounded by an unwillingness to devote time to talking over problems resulted in a greater recourse to exclusion (Cullen *et al.* 1996c: 30 -31).

One important outcome of the work of Moray House researchers has been the "... introduction of national guidance on exclusion" (SOEID 1998: 2). Whilst official statements reflects a shift regarding circumstances in which Exclusion is used, Circular No 2/98 (Points 3 and 4) reiterates its seriousness. It states,

Exclusion is the most severe sanction available to schools and as such should be used only as a last resort in response to serious breaches of discipline or criminal behaviour (Circular NO 2/98: 2).

41 Following publication of project reports from Scottish research, *Exclusions from School and In-School Alternatives*, the SOED issued a new form, 'Incident Report Form: Record of a Single Exclusion', which reflects an increase in the range of categories of information schools are expected to record after an 'incident' leading to a pupil's Exclusion (SOED 1998: 22).

42 See Interchange No 47, *Exclusions and In-school Alternatives*, Edinburgh: SOEID .

An explicit reference to criminality, a departure from former formulations, is followed by a statement that refers explicitly to official expectations that in matters of Exclusion education authorities, schools and procedures reflect the principles of inclusion and equality of treatment.

Education authorities and schools should seek to minimise their need to use exclusion procedures through adopting an inclusive approach, i.e., one under which all pupils are treated equally and offered an educational experience which they value (Circular NO 2/98: 2).

Official advice on decision making explicitly highlights the negotiated character of Exclusion. In reference to a principle of 'best practice', professionals are advised to adopt a 'multi-disciplinary' approach and 'inter-agency' co-operation in their treatment of pupils (Circular no 2/98: 20 -21). Official circulars offer encouragement for practitioners that shows Exclusion *ought to be* negotiated in reference to the principles of 'best interests of the child' and the 'risk to good order'. These principles draw attention to a central problem faced by teachers in classrooms, that of balancing a pupil's needs within the needs of a collective. Official accounts of sebd and Exclusion are structured by formal educational categories, which produces a positivistic account of Exclusions. Lukes showed the limits of 'behaviourism' in the exercise of power and its potential for excluding actors from a debate (Lukes 1974). Public accounts of Exclusion, derived from formal categories, cannot be reflexive in accounting for pupils 'performances' or 'behavioural difficulties' at school. Reflexivity for Garfinkel, in contrast to Parsons, is that the act of making 'action' accountable is a central social activity, in which rules of everyday interaction are not 'taken as given', but actually worked out in time (Heritage 1984). Thus, the character of Garfinkel's formulation of reflexivity and its implication for the relationship between 'knowledge' and 'action' is illustrated in the SOIED's cautioning of readers about the interpretative limits of official accounts of Exclusion (HMI 1997).

Official attempts to overcome these problems lead to descriptive examples that 'type' or label children in terms of 'behavioural difficulties'. Official accounts offer brief narrative accounts of 'typical' examples of individual Excluded pupils (HMI/Ofsted 1995/6: 32 -39). Descriptions of experiences are presented as 'types of pupils', which obscure the negotiated character of problem solving among social actors (See Chapter Three). These kinds of accounts fail to give a sociologically informed account of 'incidents' defined as acts of pupil in/discipline.

Education in early twenty first century has not succeeded in transcending unintended negative effects associated with categories, for example, 'behavioural difficulties'; children defined in this way emerge from accounts of Exclusion as 'functionalist deviants', thus actors' social meanings and the explanatory possibilities they offer are obscured. Research shows differential policies and practices about Exclusion have led to differential experiences of Exclusion between education authorities, north and south of the border.

an event in a discursive process

Official accounts of debates about definition, provision and organisation of official and professional responses to problems of order in schools, constitute 'discursive' networks, for example, among local educational authorities and within local education authorities and their schools over information schools are expected to collect.⁴³ A distinctive feature in Scottish education, is that educational change is largely introduced via guidelines rather than by statute, as in England and Wales. A wide range of concerned public bodies, including parents, are invited to participate in its 'consultative processes'. Educational criteria eventually emerge from debates among HM Inspectors of schools, who act as independent policy advisers and commentators on the state's provision of education including a range of professionals who work in education. Decisions emerging from a 'consultative' process become evident in official circulars, which provide guidance, for example, on 'definition' of and procedures regarding 'attendance' and 'absence' at school.

Official accounts of Exclusion draw largely upon information of pupil attendance/absence provided by schools and local education authorities. Drawing a distinction between learning and health and safety matters, the SOEID define 'attendance' precisely, as,

⁴³This point is well illustrated in relation to ethnicity (SED 1989). A Scottish Office Circular, *Ethnically-based Statistics on School Pupils*, issued to schools in August of 1989, encouraged schools to collect baseline data with the aim of monitoring ethnicity in Scottish education. Official arguments for data collection was premised on the idea that schools provide education for children and young people, and are employers of people from 'minority ethnic' backgrounds. Again, in 1994 to 1996 school census data collection periods, the Scottish Office attempted to collect data at school level regarding 'minority ethnic' children. These attempts were not a success as response by schools and local education authorities was poor; data that was collected was considered to be unreliable (See below).

... participation in the programme of educational activities arranged by the school (Circular No 1/95 January, 1995: 2).

Pupils must attend school regularly and arrive on time, matters that are registered daily. Whilst the circular clearly defines 'attendance', 'absence' is not defined. Teachers fill in a daily register of pupils' attendance, which provides baseline data about Exclusion. Any claim to reliable recording of Exclusion, turns upon a clear definition of 'authorised' and 'unauthorised' absence from school (SOED 1995a). Official accounts of Exclusion emerge from a process of decision making at school level, about the nature and character of a pupil's 'absence', which is then registered in his/her individual pupil record. Illustrative of general confusion around the question of defining and recording of pupil 'absence' has led to broad consultation and debate within Scotland.⁴⁴ Definitions of 'absence' are highly contested at school level, reflecting as they do the serious matter of who makes the choices that lead to pupil's/student's 'absence', the pupil or the school.⁴⁵

Scottish educational circulars show definitions of 'absence' remain in flux, to suggest official record keeping leads to blurred statistical information. Guidance offered to education authorities, schools and teachers, for example, cautions those who actually fill in information forms for return to the SOED. For example, Circular No

44 The extent and breadth of debates are reflected in SOED Circular No 8/94 and its replacement Circular No 1/95. Circular No 1/95 reflects attempts to clarify formal definition of 'authorised absence'. Circular No 1/95, Sections 6.4 to 6.7 describe the range and scope of categories used to collect data on 'attendance', 'authorised' and 'unauthorised absence' from school, which demonstrate a potential for differential interpretation of action. For example, it states that in serious cases "arising from incidents in class (or) arising from incidents out of class" (see section 6.4- 6.5) pupils/students may find themselves subject to classification in the following categories: 'temporary exclusion', 'truancy and other'. Definition of 'serious' are assumed to be self evident, or understood as 'taken for granted'. The circular goes on to describe a range of reasons, for which pupils can be 'withdrawn from the school register', which is a descriptive form of stating a pupil is subject to 'permanent exclusion' (Points 6.6 to 6.7).

45 For discussion of similar debates about the definition of 'attendance' and 'absence' in English and Welsh schools see, Blyth and Milner (1996: 12 -15). See also M. Stirling (1992b) 'How many pupils are being excluded?' *British Journal of Special Education*, 19, 4, : 128 -130, for a head teacher's view of exclusion, and R. Cohen and M. Hughes (with L. Ashworth and M. Blair) (1994) *School's out: the family perspective on exclusion*, London: Family Service Units, Barnardos.

1/95 distinguishes between classification and decision making in recording pupil 'absence'. The information required, "... relates to **classification** of absence not **decisions** as to the granting of absence in particular cases" (Circular No 1/95, see section 7). Schools are required to make their decision about classification of 'absence' from school by reference to SOEID guidelines. Drawing upon a list of possible reasons that may match a pupil's absence, it is up to teachers to determine the nature of a pupil's 'absence' from school. Thus, definition of 'absence' is located within a specific set of localised school relations, which are characteristically negotiated to a greater or lesser degree. Constituted within discursive networks, 'school relations' among state officials, civil servants, professionals and parents emerge from a 'negotiated order', in which children are compelled to engage in education in a process of achieving a socially and/or academic acceptable 'self'. Formal categories refer to education as a system, such categories are not reflexive and thus cannot examine discursive processes which lead to a pupil's Exclusion. Explanation of Exclusion requires that schools and schooling be conceptualised as 'negotiated orders' (Strauss 1964).

- *principle of 'last resort'*

In schools, changes in the organisation and practice of responses to pupils in 'trouble', highlights the negotiated character of teaching/learning relations. A decline in popular and professional acceptance of corporal punishment as a legitimate, or, effective way of teaching pupils 'self' discipline led to its abolition (Spiel 1962). Corporal punishment in state schools up to circa 1980, was officially governed by the principle of 'last resort'. In Scotland, abolition of corporal punishment began with the publication of the final report of the *COSLA Working Group on Corporal Punishment* in 1981. Official removal of corporal punishment from schools presented an opportunity to study school processes and major changes in schools' discipline systems (Venables 1980). McLean's seminal article, 'After the belt: school processes in low-exclusion schools', argued a school's 'ideology' was a key factor in creating a disciplined school that did not resort to Exclusion as a way of controlling 'at risk' or 'vulnerable' pupils (McLean 1987: 303 -310). McLean's concept of 'at risk' refers to social deprivation and provides a typical example of how in the literature, problems of sebd/EBD and wilful 'bad' behaviour become conflated in conditions of social deprivation. McLean argued that the values of schools rather than the 'at risk' status of the pupil have a greater influence upon the use of Exclusion (Reynolds 1976a; Rutter *et al.* 1979). More recently this theme is

conceptualised as a 'school's ethos', characterised along a continuum from inclusion to exclusion (Munn 1999).

The combined effects of the abolition of corporal punishment, the introduction of comprehensive education and the raising of the school leaving age gave rise to a demand for supportive measures largely to assist the classroom teacher (Gray *et al.* 1983). In Scottish schools, the introduction of a guidance system created a new post of guidance teacher, whose professional remit was to establish formal, but supportive relations, with individual pupils, especially for those pupils 'in trouble' at school (Howieson and Semple 1996; SED 1968). Guidance teachers are expected to support and advise subject teachers on their guidance responsibilities for their pupils (Peterson 1992). In Scottish secondary schools, initiatives for those 'in trouble' at school, include **Youth Strategy** (YS), are expected to be in place to offer a range of alternative ways of supporting secondary school pupils. All secondary schools are expected to form a **School Liaison Group** (SLG) which brings together a range of professionals able to offer specialised support for pupils 'in trouble'; possibly for social and emotional reasons or as a supportive response to pupils whose persistent rule-breaking was placing them at risk of Exclusion (Pickles 1992). The Guidance teacher also uses other strategies, for example, **behavioural contracts**, **group work**, **social education** and in more affluent schools, **counselling** services (Peterson, 1992).⁴⁶

Exclusion represents a 'communicative' failure between teachers and pupils. The principle of 'last resort' now refers to Exclusion.⁴⁷ Exclusion, as an 'event' in a 'process' of exclusion (Booth 1996: 34-35) is an outcome of a pupil's in/ability to 'negotiate' his/her 'school relations'. If a pupil is Excluded inappropriately, then appeals may be framed in terms of his/her discriminatory treatment within his social relations at school.

46 Chapter Three discusses details of these strategies, their implications for the research design in this study, whilst Chapter Seven discusses arguments for and against the use of these strategies. Chapter Eight draws upon teachers views regarding punishment and support of pupils 'in trouble' at school, to discuss these strategies and Guidance issues.

47 See Gatherer, 1999: 995-996, in Bryce and Humes edited collection *Scottish Education*.

- *outcomes for parents and children*

Exclusion illustrates a paradox within state education. On the one hand children are compelled to attend school. On the other, increasing numbers of children are Excluded for failing to co-operate with formal demands of schools and/or schooling. Parents' responsibilities for educating children are brought into sharp focus when a child is Excluded (SOEID 1997b; SOEID 1998). Educational law states,

The law requires that **parents** must provide for their children of school age efficient education suitable to their **age, ability and aptitude** ... (Marr and Marr 1995:1)

In exercising responsibility for their child's education, parents must negotiate a pupil's return to school, for example in cases of *temporary* Exclusion. Negotiations between school and parents and/or pupil may extend to include the education authority. Whilst the law states, "**Education authorities** must secure that there is made for their area adequate and efficient provision of school education" (Marr and Marr 1995: 1), education authorities can refuse to accept a child. Marr and Marr discuss general provisions regarding attendance orders, which show written orders made by a court,

... requir(e) the parent to make sure that his child regularly attends a specified school, not necessarily an education authority school, *which must be prepared to take the child* [my italics] (Marr and Marr 1995: 57).

In cases where a child is refused, parents may either appeal against a school's decision or have to find their child another school. Parents are thus faced with finding a school that will accept their son or daughter, stigmatised in Goffman's sense, by his/her official label of Excluded pupil (Goffman 1963).

In Scotland, the power and circumstances under which a pupil can be Excluded are set out in regulation 4 to the Schools General (Scotland) Regulations 1975.⁴⁸ Two main circumstances for Exclusion are,

... the education authority are of the opinion that the parent of the pupil refuses or fails to comply, or to allow the pupil to comply with the rules, regulations or disciplinary requirements of the school; or...

⁴⁸ See SI 1975/1135: The relevant regulations are the Schools General (Scotland) (Amendment) Regulations 1982 (SI1982/56) and the Schools General (Scotland) amendment (No 2) Regulations 1982 (SI 1982/1735).

... the education authority consider that in all the circumstances to allow the pupil to continue his/her attendance at the school would be likely to be seriously detrimental to order and discipline in the school or the educational well-being of pupils there (Munn *et al.* 1997:12).⁴⁹

The power to Exclude a pupil from school rests with the local education authority, but it is open to an authority to devolve the ability to Exclude a pupil to school level.⁵⁰ Parents, school and education authority thus enter into a more complex network of formal relations in which appropriate action in the form of appeals is governed by *time* constraints set out in the legislation. A significant outcome of Exclusion is **loss of school time** and a greater likelihood of an Excluded pupil 'falling behind' with school work. In association with 'de-schooling',⁵¹ 'falling behind' in schoolwork is argued to have an impact upon reintegration. Official accounts recognise that in a busy school day pressures of time upon teaching and learning contribute towards issues of *differential treatment of pupils* which impacts negatively upon the quality of educational experience. Official and professional debates about the 'quality of educational provision', framed in terms of the principle of 'best practice', have recently been sharpened in the context of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995 and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (SOEID 1998: 2).

- *an outcome of social difference*

Official accounts of Exclusion, as presented to parliament, the public and educators, effectively compress a range of individual psychological, cognitive and social difficulties experienced by pupils under two main labels; in/discipline and/or sebd/EBD. Pupils who experience Exclusion are described as living socially complex lives, variously differentiated in terms of material deprivation, gender, and/or minority ethnic background. Drawing upon the Elton Report, 'Discipline in Schools' (1989), 'Pupils with Problems' offered guidance to schools to help them

49 In arrangements outlined in Circular No 2/98 these principles for Exclusion remain in place (SOED 1998: 4).

50 See Munn *et al.* 1997, Exclusion and In-school Alternatives, Interchange 47, for a concise account of the diversity to be found in Scotland regarding the practice of Exclusion.

51 De-schooling is not a reference to Illich (1973), but is used in this context to mean 'getting out of the habit of getting up and getting to school on time'.

maintain good behaviour by teaching young people to respect others (DFE, May 1994). Social exclusion, broadly defined as access to the benefits of citizenship is translated into educational policy by a New Labour government, which reiterates a belief in the role of education with regard to social inclusion. Recent circulars, 'Social Inclusion: pupil support', prioritise social deprivation in their guidance to schools to advocate support of pupils in their attendance, behaviour and re-integration at school (DfEE 1999).

The disproportionate numbers of boys permanently Excluded, four to one at secondary school level and twenty one to one at primary school level, raises questions about the role of gender in Exclusion (NERS August 1998: 1; HMI/OFSTED 1996). The DFEE state, "... 83% of permanent exclusion were of boys in 1996/1997" (DFEE 30 September: 2). Pupils defined as having 'behavioural' difficulties are treated separately, to note a significant imbalance between the rates of boys relative to girls. In England and Wales the ratio of boys to girls in co-educational schools for children with EBD, commonly ranges from 4:1 to 10:1, and in some instances reaches 40:1. (DFE 1994a). In Scotland information was not collated by gender, but Scottish research has limited evidence of boys as disproportionately Excluded (Munn *et al* 1997 Interchange, No 47, SOEID).

Official accounts of sebd and Exclusion note the disproportionate number of boys who experience Exclusion, but accounts reflect 'taken for granted' essentialist assumptions about gender (DFE 1994: Circular No, 10/94). Gender stereotypes are used to describe different types of 'behaviour' likely to be exhibited by girls and boys who are experiencing difficulties (DFE Circular No 9/94: 122). The negative impact of boys 'behaviour' on teachers' attention to girls is noted,

It is generally accepted that, in mixed schools, boys demand and may obtain disproportionate teacher time. The needs of girls and young women are consequently often overlooked and unmet (Circular No 9/94: 122).

The document notes resource implications of gender differences, especially for girls experiencing difficulties at school who may need separate provision (Circular No 9/94: 123). Problematic issues are not addressed consistently, for girls or boys, whether as white or minority ethnic children, or directly as an aspect of social deprivation.

The importance of having a parent, and one who is capable of helping a child negotiate problems in 'school relations', is evident among poor and 'looked after'

pupils, for whom Exclusion is not a new phenomenon (HMSO 1995; Warnock 1978). Brodie cites a range of research which indicates Exclusion is a feature of many poor children's educational experience, and highlights boys and girls who are 'looked after' or 'in public care' in local authority 'homes' (Brodie 1998; DFH 1995; Jackson 1994).⁵² Long term social exclusion is a well recognised feature of educational exclusion with respect to children who are 'looked after' by the state. Children who are 'looked after' are disproportionately represented among children who are Excluded. Research shows 'looked after' children to have an increased likelihood of psycho- social disorder related to social disadvantage (Smith 1995).

Disproportionate numbers of children from minority ethnic backgrounds permanently Excluded in England and Wales has given rise to public and official concern. NERS report that both regional and national studies indicate African-Caribbean males are Excluded at almost six-times the rate of white pupils. DfEE information illustrates that Exclusion among pupils who are Black or from other minority ethnic groupings is experienced differentially within minority ethnic groupings,

The overall permanent exclusion rate was 0.19% in 1996/97; the exclusion rates for Black Caribbean, Black African and Black Other pupils were 0.76%, 0.30% and 0.70% respectively; the exclusion rate for Indian, Pakistani, and Bangladeshi pupils were 0.05%, 0.17% and 0.9% respectively; the exclusion rate for Chinese pupils was 0.04%, the exclusion rate for White pupils was 0.18% (DFEE 30 September 1998: 2).

'Pupils with Problems', refers to the Race Relations Act of 1975, to caution educators not to confuse 'cultural differences' with 'misbehaviour' in their treatment of ethnically distinctive pupils. NERS, for example, cites religious or cultural 'non-conformity' as reasons that had been given for Exclusion of pupils from ethnically distinctive backgrounds. These comments echo Tomlinson's work (1982) which shows that the category of 'educationally subnormal' (ESN) was used to Exclude ethnically distinctive pupils in disproportionate numbers to white pupils. Ofsted's report, *Education for Disaffected Pupils*, (OFSTED 1993) is explicitly concerned with issues of racism, with respect to Excluded African and African-Caribbean boys, but

⁵² This point illustrates a weakness in legislation that lays the responsibility of education of children on the shoulders of their parents. However, this kind of problem illustrates the dilemma of the liberal state in relation to securing the rights of children. See Chapter Three for discussion on these tensions.

nevertheless labels boys as 'disaffected'. Specific information about girls from similar backgrounds is less forthcoming. Educators seek explanations of these phenomena in order to remedy what they argue is effectively a racist education (Majors *et al.* 1996).

Significant ethnic minority groups live in Scotland, but relatively little is known of their educational experiences (Arshad 1992). Bamford's early review of research literature referring to gender and education in Scotland, argued research into issues around ethnicity was much needed (Bamford 1988). In Scotland, the yearly official census of Scottish schools did not include the category ethnicity until 1999, so systematic data has not been collected.⁵³ Limited Scottish research indicates ethnic minority children do experience racial harassment in Scottish schools (Donald *et al.* 1994).⁵⁴ Newspaper articles about the death of Imran Khan, a Glasgow pupil stabbed by two young white males indicate ethnicity is a subject that educators must address in Scotland.⁵⁵ In Scotland a recent newspaper survey on the experience of racial harassment at school reported the most significant experiences

53 As I write this the death of Steven Lawrence is a central topic of public debate. Institutional racism in the Metropolitan Police has been identified as a serious issue to be addressed. In Scottish schools, as late as February 1999, the yearly school census did not have a category for collecting baseline numerical data about possible numbers of pupils whose educational needs may be shaped by a cultural background that is distinctive from the majority of pupils in Scottish schools. Arguably this absence of information could be considered to be an issue of institutional racism. New attempts are expected to be made to overcome this problem. (Telephone conversation to the Scottish Executive's Education Department, June 1999). See Peach (1996) for early discussion on difficulties encountered by statisticians who wish to include the category of 'ethnicity'.

54 Problems associated with ethnic difference are reflected in this thesis, which is drawn from interviews with and observations of ethnically distinctive pupils. Pupils described how they felt about their ethnic difference, defining themselves as Scottish-Asian and Scottish-Chinese.

55 Analysis of a range of recent circulars published by the SOEID revealed a survey: Reported Incidents of Violence Against School Staff -1997 -98. The categories contain two boxes for respondents to tick, "if relevant". The question posed is a numerical question. "Number of racially motivated". "Numbers of sexually motivated", which as I have argued cannot provide an reflexive account, which given the seriousness of the issues involved requires a fuller inquiry than a summative account can provide. Circular No 5/97 has attached Annex A, which requires more extensive information to be collected and noted with respect to 'violence and aggression' against staff (SOEID 1997a).

of racism in Scotland were among English pupils!⁵⁶ Macintosh's account of Scottish Asian girls published in 1992, and Tizard and Phoenix's research with young people whose parents were of 'mixed race' (Tizard and Phoenix 1993) illustrate the sociological complexity of ethnicity. As a research issue, differential treatment of ethnically distinctive pupils requires great sensitivity and an adequate methodology.⁵⁷

An absence of accurate monitoring of social characteristics of pupils in the UK's two distinctive education systems is noted, for example, Scottish research indicates a lack of data on pupil social characteristics, apart from basic sex and st/age, for example, no information regarding race/ethnicity, pupil socio economic status (ses) and Record of Need is gathered systematically (Cullen *et al.* 1996a: 28). Similar limitations are noted in England and Wales, "Exclusions *ought* to be monitored on the basis of number, duration, ethnicity, gender, age of pupils" (Circular No 10/94:17).

Gender, ethnicity, class, and being 'looked after' come together over issues of dress and separate provision for PE and swimming. A potential for 'difference' among pupils is demonstrated in times when issues of perceived 'difference' are negotiated, for example,

Exclusion is not an appropriate response to pupils (girls in veils and boys in turbans) who cannot comply with the uniform or dress regulations for cultural or religious reasons; to exclude under such circumstances might constitute unlawful indirect discrimination under the Race Relations Act, 1976 ... It is also unreasonable to exclude pupils who through no fault of their own (pupils whose parents are unable to support their children with their

56 Within a broad overview of *Scottish Education*, published in 1999, ethnicity is addressed as a problem within traditional 'sectarianism' and religion in the West of Scotland (Finn 1999), and as linked to 'race' and its impact in achieving equality in Scottish education (Arshad and Diniz 1999).

57 It is worrying to consider the relative imbalance of data collection in Scotland. Data has been collected from schools regarding racist incidences against teachers (See Circular No 5/97 'Reporting incidents of violence') and data is to be collected in relation to the numbers of 'minority ethnic' children who are Excluded, and, via category 10, 'Racist Incident'. The recorder is invited to tick or leave absent, to indicate whether or not incidents that lead to Exclusion are racist in their 'circumstances'. In all three cases findings will be in the form of summative statements (See Circular No 2/98).

unrelenting daily needs) are unable to comply with uniform, dress or similar demands although this should be a rare occurrence (Circular 10/94: 25).

Social matters are evidently significant in pupils' everyday negotiation of their educational experience. Explanation of Exclusion is severely constrained by limited information about pupils who are Excluded. In practice, social and academic 'difference' among pupils is a problem negotiated in a public domain, within networks of normative relations, among social actors who have differential opportunities to influence debates and decisions. In the chapters that follow, analyses of these kinds of discursive processes are presented.

Explanations for the rise in rates of Exclusion

Research indicates pupils' backgrounds and a range of social factors are of central salience in pupils' experience of being 'in trouble' at school. In relation to families, many children live in families who may not be able to provide them with adequate care. Brodie sums research findings,

Age, gender, ethnicity and social disadvantage have all been identified as significant factors in exclusion ... The most striking aspect of the backgrounds of children excluded from school is, however, the high level of social disadvantage that most have experienced including poverty, homelessness and parental illness and bereavement. This is also reflected in the seemingly large numbers of children looked after by local authorities (Brodie 1998: 2).

Clearly such a wide range of negative social experience creates complex problems which present largely at school.

Explanations for rises in Exclusion in England and Wales broadly describe Exclusion as an outcome of a shift in education as a 'meritocracy', which attempted to support learning through a 'child centred' approach, to its becoming a 'parentocracy', which approaches learning as measurable in terms of examination success, a process traced to 1978 and the Great Debate on Education called for by James Callaghan. Taken up by New right, as reflected in Thatcherist criticism of educational standards in state schools, the debate led to 'new vocationalism' and arguably a return to a positivist view of education, as a source of measurable skills and knowledge. Official moves to give parents a more active role in schools decision making in a context of school funding that was more closely tied to success in public

examinations (Ball *et al.* 1995).⁵⁸ The publication of league tables heightened schools attempts to attract pupils in a market-based educational system.⁵⁹

Legislative changes regarding the role of parents in the education system differed in Scotland from England and Wales in significant respects.⁶⁰ Within both educational systems, similar concerns are raised with regard to the impact of political and organisational changes in educational provision upon pupils with 'behavioural difficulties'.⁶¹ Pupils whose 'behaviour' does not, a) enhance the image of the school and b) make positive contributions to the schools attainment tests results, around which competition between schools for funding revolves, are viewed by some schools as not worth the 'costs' involved (Parsons 1999: 175-182). These features are argued to deter some schools from working to include pupils labelled as 'disaffected'. In a nutshell, educating such pupils costs more in terms of time and finance and brings a school a 'bad' name.

Echoing this view Blyth and Milner argue Exclusion is school driven, "It does not refer to a child or young person absenting him or herself from school, for example

58For an overview of Marxist critiques of liberal education and the shifting character of the role of parents within education, see Brown, P (1990) 'The 'Third Wave': Education and the Ideology of Parentocracy'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 11: 65 -85.

59For an overview of these arguments as they apply in the USA, see, Chubb J.E. and Moe T.M. 'Politics, Markets, and the Organization of Schools' in Halsey *et al.* (1997) *Education, Culture, Economy and Society* Oxford New York: Oxford University Press.

60 See Riddell and Brown (1994) for an account of the impact of legislative changes in the 1980's on SEN provision, who cite Munn's summary of key differences between the two educational systems, to suggests, "... the emphasis on parents as a mechanism for school quality control flows from a U.K. policy agenda, yet that policy has found rather different expression[s] ... for example, the 1981 Education (Scotland) Act introduced a more radical notion of parental choice than the 1980 Education Act for England and Wales. In contrast, the 1988 Education Act gives more extensive powers to school governing bodies than the 1988 School Boards Act, and Scotland has had a separate Act, the oddly named Self-Governing Schools etc. (Scotland) Act, 1989, to introduce the right of schools to opt out of local authority control (Riddell and Brown 1994: 2 -3)".

61 See Munn, P. (1991) 'School boards, accountability and control', *British Journal of Educational Studies* 39, 2: 173 -189. As a caveat, attempts to get schools to 'opt out' of local authority control had little impact on the state education system in Scotland as only two schools 'opted out' and one of those schools has since 'opted back in'.

by truancy, although the school can achieve this outcome by excluding a truant" (Blyth and Milner 1996:3). Exclusion *and* truancy, exemplify Bourdieu's notion of social exclusion of socially deprived pupils as 'elimination', either through examination failure due to lack of 'cultural capital' or 'self elimination' by choosing not to enter a level of education considered as 'not for the likes of us' (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990a: 141 -176). A rise in the recorded rate of exclusions from mainstream and special schools, is thought partly due to a reported rise in incidents of serious in/discipline among pupils (Munn 1999: 408). Teachers (indirectly) and head teachers (directly) have formal responsibility for Exclusion, which raises questions about the conditions and character of negotiations that lead to defining a pupil's actions as serious in/discipline. Labelling pupils as 'disaffected' raises questions about what pupils might be 'disaffected' from. Exclusion and truancy emerge as two related processes that reflect social and educational outcomes as negatively reinforcing the very social inequalities that education was introduced to ameliorate.

Summary

Problems of in/discipline within a forced collectivity as reflected in a rise in Exclusion rates, have become a 'public issue'; traditional explanations for in/discipline as an issue of 'private trouble' (Mills 1959) are inadequate. Public accounts of the state's provision of mass education are structured by its formal categories, which produce aggregate data collected from local education authorities and schools, presented in what is largely a **positivist** account of schools and schooling. As 'taken for granted' knowledge, these kinds of accounts have effectively obscured the **socially constructed** character of education; its categories and methodologies have led to pupils (and their families) being labelled as 'failures' for not benefiting from its provision. Based on 'raw' categorical details, for example, the publication of school league tables provides an apparently scientific and therefore powerful, measure of pupils and thus a schools public examination performance, which has social and educational implications for children, and social and financial implications for schools. Official accounts of education emerge as constrained within a summative discourse that treats education in functionalist terms as a system; nevertheless, this chapter's focus has been Exclusion as an official 'event' in a complex and **ambiguous** social process, which in principle leads to charges of **discriminatory treatment** of pupils (SOED 1998: 2). This chapter has critically engaged with 'taken for granted' categories that construct official, professional and academic accounts of Exclusion.

Official and professional accounts of Exclusion in Scotland, show significant variation in policy definitions of Exclusion, and variation in practice, for example, in interpretation and recording of pupils 'absence'; treated as data, these accounts raise doubts about the reliability of the public account of Exclusions. Examination of official accounts of Exclusion show them as inadequate, i) due to policy variation across local education authorities; ii) due to the **non-reflexive** character of its categories, as unable to account for the negotiated character of pupils' experiences of Exclusion; iii) as unable to account for the gendered character of Exclusion. A general characteristic of pupils who are Excluded is their 'absence' from a context where they *ought to be*, that is, participating in a broad and balanced curriculum. Pupils who experience Exclusion emerge as negatively differentiated from teachers' notions of an 'ideal pupil' (Becker [1952]1971), and the social and academic 'success' such pupils 'attain' at school. Research into Exclusion reveals significant variation in the rates and experience of Exclusion, for example, with respect to social categories of gender, class and 'minority ethnicity'.

The chapter's examination of official, professional and academic accounts of Exclusion and a closely related sebd, show these phenomena as referring to pupils 'in trouble' at school, either as unable and/or as not willing to act co-operatively with teachers and other pupils at school. The chapter argues that pupils 'in trouble' at school become socially constructed mainly in terms of two ambiguous professional labels, 'behavioural difficulties' and 'disaffection'. These labels emerge as normative in character, due to their reference to the state's compulsion of children to attend, to behave and to attain at school, as a means of gaining access to skills, knowledge and social graces, which arguably equip children to enter the adult social world as capable of contributing to and benefiting from society.

Attendance at school necessarily requires children to participate in a network of 'school relations', arguably governed by the principle of 'equality of opportunity' and 'promise to benefit' (Strong 1918). The chapter rejects concepts of 'behaviours', to analyse Exclusion as an outcome of interpretation of 'action'. Schools and schooling are constituted by relations among teacher and pupils, for example, teachers record pupils 'attendance' and 'absence' on a daily basis. Acts of in/discipline that lead to Exclusion are reflected in a school's register, which form the basis of statistical knowledge about Exclusion rates. As a 'last resort', Exclusion is a punishment that senior teachers authorise, which leads to the removal of a child's name from the school register. Teachers interpretation and recording of a

pupil's absence, as 'authorised' or 'unauthorised', is expected to accord with a school's policy regarding these categories. Descriptions of conditions and precise details of negotiations between actors (teachers and pupils) do not contribute towards the public account of Exclusion; significantly and most importantly, actor's interpretations, intentions and the explanatory possibilities they offer are obscured.

My analysis of 'consultative processes' at the heart of Scottish education, though limited to a number of circulars, shows i) the discursive networks that constitute education, its organisation and practice, and ii) the nature and character of particular debates, for example, the ambiguity of Exclusion is reflected in the range of potential definitions of 'absence' whether 'authorised' or 'unauthorised'. Exclusion is shown to emerge from within a social network of formal relations, in which negotiation of 'school relations' and schooling is the social order of the day. Within schools, guidance teachers offer a range of strategies for pupils in 'trouble' at school, which rests upon regular discussion about the problems pupils encounter. Wexler writes, " ... it is impossible to think of social structures or forms of culture as solid stable entities" and notes that young people in his research want to 'become somebody' (Wexler 1992). The socially constructed character of Exclusion is evident in that schools can refuse a parental request for a child to attend school. A school's decision leads to a child being out of school for long periods, thus missing out on teaching, learning and preparation of work folios necessary for presentation for public examinations. An outcome of Exclusion is that it reduces a child's chance of reintegration into school and school work, and of 'becoming someone' who is socially respected and accepted.

Theorising Exclusion as 'school relations', in contrast to 'behaviours', allows consideration of the normative character of 'school relations', the degree of negotiation between actors at the level of interaction, and an analysis of actors' interpretations and intentions in schools and schooling, conceptualised as '**negotiated order**'. Exclusion of a pupil emerges as an official 'event' in a discursive process of 'becoming' a negatively labelled pupil, as 'failed', and by implication their parents, to negotiate 'school relations' and the educative possibilities those relations provide. Exclusion thus re-inforces pre-existing forms of social inequality, which ultimately reproduces the problems education was introduced to ameliorate.

Chapter Two

Theoretical resources for social inquiry into in/discipline at school

standing on the shoulders of giants

Introduction

This chapter briefly describes and criticises functionalist theories of 'social order' to demonstrate an explanatory inadequacy in official and professional accounts of in/discipline in schools. The chapter outlines Durkheim's account of 'deviance' as a 'normal' and necessary aspect of social groupings to challenge the adequacy of individualism's explanation of in/discipline in schools. The chapter outlines rule formation as socially constructed within specific conditions. The concepts of 'rule following' and 'gender' are critically examined in preparation for analysing normative labelling among pupils and teachers that emerges at school. School rules offer a codified version of 'institutional order', but at school, personal and social identities are constituted within actors' negotiation of everyday rules of interaction. Conceptualised as a social institution, or a 'negotiated order', the thesis presents 'institutional order' and everyday 'social order' of gender relations at school as mutually constituted.

Individuality, individualism and moral individualism

Schools are argued to be socially organised by rationalist principles characteristic of modernity. Modern man⁶² begins with Hobbesian man,

⁶² Hobbes is talking about the category of 'man'; he does not use the word in the generic sense of human kind. The limited social power of women relative to men evident in society is reflected in the academy. The claim of academic feminism is that the exclusionary effects of the academy's practices have had implications for the production of knowledge about the social world. The logic of my general argument will not be possible to follow if I engage at this point with feminist critiques of the academy's traditional exclusion of women and by extension their ideas. I am assuming Hobbes definition to be inclusionary, and where the category fails in terms of its adequacy to include a breadth of human experience is precisely where empirical evidence will be called upon to suggest new ways forward.

... during the time men live without a common power to keep them all in awe they are in that condition which is called warre; and such a warre is of every man against every man ... (Hobbes 1651).

Hobbesian 'man' acts in a self-interested way, so how can social order be secured? Hobbes' reference to a 'common power' reflects inherent social tensions in the allocation and use of resources. Theories that explain social order in modernity through the concept of power consider 'individuality' and 'individualism' as conceptually distinctive.⁶³ Two general forms of social order are argued as constitutive of social life; egoistic order as self interested, and normative order as collective interest. Explaining the relationship between the two constitutes a continuing problem for social theory (Dawe 1970). Consideration of problems of order and control have shaped sociology from its inception and continue to do so as, "The thesis that sociology is centrally concerned with the problem of social order has become one of the discipline's few orthodoxies" (Dawe 1970: 207). Dawe argues that the problem of social order is a basic premise of many sociological theories. Dawe differentiates between 'two sociologies' grounded in diametrically opposed concerns of order, as associated with social *system*, and control as associated with social *action*. Dawe argues that the notion of social system and social action, "...at every level, ... are in conflict" (Dawe 1970: 214) In attempts to transcend explanatory inadequacy, debates have turned upon establishing which is the derivative of the other (Holmwood 1996).

According to individualism, human beings are argued to act from the following principles; acting 'rationally' individuals are characteristically understood to act independently, in a rationally calculative manner, egoistically oriented to their own goals. An Enlightenment 'individual' is theoretically imagined as acting from, as Reisman describes,

the two well known *a prioris* of self-interest and calculative rationality (Reisman 1990, quoted by Barnes 1996: 11).

⁶³ See Raymond Williams (1976) *Keywords*, for a short historical account of the emergence of 'individuality' and 'individualism' as distinctive features of modernity that contrast with medieval and early modern definitions of social order.

In this formulation of individuality, 'economic rationality'⁶⁴ shapes individual action in a self interested way, referred to as 'wants' or 'desires', to meet a person's own needs first. Barnes writes,

It is commonly assumed that the wants of individuals can be ranked in an order of priority and preference and that individuals act optimally to realise their preferences. It is also assumed that preferences and their rank order are fixed and stable (Barnes 1996: 12).

Functionalism shares the view of 'economic rationality' with respect to individuality, arguing for an enduring stability of the individual as autonomous, as being *fixed in properties and nature*, but able to come together with others strategically to create pragmatic patterns of interaction. Barnes defends an individualistic perspective to a degree, arguing that approaches to solving problems that begin by looking at individuals are,

... perfectly plausible ... to conjecture that it is through observing individuals, and theorising about the basis of what they individually do, that we shall come to an understanding of social life and social order, that a society is the aggregate of all the separately engendered actions of its individual members (Barnes 1996: 11).

The power of the notion of the individual as the place to start in creating an explanation for social dis/order in schools is understandable, for as Barnes⁶⁵ argues, although the notion of the individual as acting according to 'economic rationality' is opposed by many major social theorists, they nevertheless 'actually rely upon individualistic kinds of explanations'. Barnes suggests that theoretical limitations of the 'functionalist individual' have to be '... kept firmly in mind'. Barnes writes,

The formulation of links and connections between particulars is what theorising is about. Where there is no theory there is no sociology (Barnes 1996: 2).

Justification of using individualism as a place to start in theorising social change emerges as a qualification of theoretical 'individualism' in terms of the degree to

⁶⁴ See Barnes (1995: 13-23) for a discussion about the concept of 'economic rationality'; its role in economic and game theory models of human behaviour .

⁶⁵ See Barnes (1995 :10 -31) for a fuller account of the effects of 'economic rationality' and 'individualistic' perspectives in social theory more generally.

which actors act in this way. Sometimes individual egoism, on occasions, is overridden by altruistic concerns, a point that is essential in attempts to explain social change. Functionalist accounts of the individual, despite their claims to formalise social relations by drawing upon empirical evidence, fail to make convincing theoretical connections between particular 'individuals' within 'society'.⁶⁶ Barnes writes,

Parson's own answer to the problem also continues in use even though the normative functionalist approach with which it is associated is no longer generally favoured (Barnes 1996: 3).

Fundamentally, individualism is not able to account for the relationship between social norms and individual action.⁶⁷

Durkheim makes a social and moral link between schooling and wider society. Society is described by Durkheim as,

... first of all a complex of ideas and sentiments, of ways of seeing and feeling, a certain intellectual and moral framework distinctive of the entire group ... society is above all a [shared] consciousness, [and] it is therefore this collective consciousness that must be imparted to the child (Durkheim 1925 *L'éducation morale*, Paris Librairie Felix Alcan).

Quoting Durkheim's questioning of Hobbes' formulation of the problem of social order Giddens writes,

For Hobbes (as for Rousseau) there is a break in continuity between the individual and society. Man is thus naturally refractory to social life; he can only resign himself to it when forced (Giddens 1972: 42-43).

⁶⁶ See Holmwood J. (1996) *Founding Sociology? Talcott Parsons and the Idea of General Theory* for a critique of Parson's attempts to formulate a social theory strongly linked to empirical evidence.

⁶⁷ For a discussion of Talcott Parsons's analysis of 'action', see Heritage (1984: 29) where he clearly summarises Parsons's position, and why Parsons's analysis of social action is criticised. Heritage does this through a discussion of the problems of rationality and intersubjectivity which roughly paraphrased means, that for Parsons rationality is defined as knowledge produced by the scientist whose method, i) is rational due to the institutionalised conditions in which it is produced (that is, the community of knowledge producers will keep individual error under control!) and ii) is more rational than the lay actor iii) whose knowledge and how it is produced about his/her own situation is less rational. Parsons has been interpreted to consider the lay social actor to be a 'judgmental dope' by comparison to the social scientist. "Parsons excludes actor's 'normative' understandings as objects of his analysis ... he considers such matters as 'behind their backs'" (Heritage 1984: 30).

Durkheim considered such a starting point for social theory as untenable. Durkheim is frequently described as a functionalist, however, Durkheim's notion of 'society', as a source of morality necessary for social integration, is not part of a functionalist account.⁶⁸ Barnes writes,

Durkheim ... is often categorized as an exponent of functionalism. But, Durkheim denied that social institutions could be explained in terms of their functions and, whenever his accounts and explanations are traced back to their source, that source turns out to be social interaction (Barnes 1995: 69)

Citing Durkheim and Mauss ([1902] 1963: 81 -2) and Durkheim's final chapter ([1915] 1976) Barnes further notes, "Although Durkheim acknowledged functionality as a "side-effect" of the ordered products of interaction, the functionalist Durkheim seems for the most part to be the accomplishment of later theorists" (Barnes 1995: 234, footnote 3).

Durkheim locates the source of social order as emanating from within everyday negotiation of action in 'society', and it is from these relations that 'society' is constituted. Unlike Hobbes, Durkheim considered 'obligations' or 'constraint' on individuals to act collectively as 'spontaneous', which in the vast majority of circumstances, is accepted by individuals. Scheff writes,

Durkheim ([1897] 1951) bequeathed to modern social thought a theoretical building block: the idea that the force of social influence is experienced by individuals as *external and constraining* (Scheff's italics) (Scheff 1988: 395).

Barnes further writes,

... human beings are, of their nature, social creatures ... that human sociability is deep seated and pervasive ... our sociability should be conceived of as a continuing profound, mutual susceptibility which finds expression in aligned cognition, shared language and knowledge, indeed in the existence of all manner of powers, skills and capacities that can be readily combined and co-ordinated with those of other people (Barnes 1996: 3-4).

⁶⁸ See Giddens (1972: 39) who suggests two broad contemporary interpretations of Durkheim's sociology. The first, largely sympathetic to Durkheim, conceptualises his work as a prolonged attempt to deal with the 'problem of order', whereas the second is critical of him as it sees Durkheim's work as an attempt to create a authoritarian theory of moral discipline.

Durkheim's legacy to sociology is the notion of social solidarity or 'society' as emerging from everyday association among actors, whom Durkheim argues are capable of producing 'society' characterised by its moral individualism.

Individualism's formal definition of the individual has been influential in shaping and directing educational theory and practice. An historical relationship between educational psychology and education has perceived its task to be the education of 'functionalist individuals' albeit in a mass context. From this theoretical perspective socially unacceptable action, defined as 'bad behaviour', is characterised as a problem of individual psychology and/or health. Treatment as a social response is largely legitimated by society, on the basis of understanding 'behaviour' in terms of personal failure to internalise society's norms. Individuals whose 'behaviour' offends against rules and social norms can be taken out of the 'social system' and 'treated' or 'fixed' in order to achieve social integration.⁶⁹ He/she can subsequently be accused and legitimately punished, argued to be a means of changing behaviour patterns, if found guilty of 'behaviour' that is deemed to be against the interests of others. The functionalist 'individual' emerges as person, characterised as independent and thus relatively easy to isolate in relation to specific acts of 'behaviour'. From this perspective problems of social order are more likely to be formulated in terms of a problem **within** an individual, or within his/her family, and less likely to be formulated as a problem that emerges from the demands of 'school relations'.⁷⁰ An outcome of its positivist approach is that schools are viewed as a 'part' of a social system that contributes to the workings of wider society, rather than as a site of particular sets of negotiated 'school relations'.

Official and professional literature reveals a persistence in viewing action at school, (particularly that of a disciplinary character) from an essentialist perspective.

⁶⁹ See E. Goffman (1961) *Asylums*, for his classic analysis of mental institutions and the social experience of those who work and are patients within them; and see also T Scheff (1966) *Being Mentally Ill: A sociological theory*.

⁷⁰ As I have pointed out in Chapter One, research into 'school effectiveness' is related to pupil 'attainment', 'truancy' and more general issues of 'disruptive behaviour', which suggest that 'whole school' responses to the organisation of resources and the provision of more sensitive curriculum have measurable positive and negative effects. For early work in this approach see Rutter, M. *et al.* (1959) *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children*, London, Open Books; Mortimore, P. *et al.* (1988) *School Matters? The Junior Years*, London, Open Books.

Making an important general interdisciplinary point, Furlong argues the impact of sociological perspective on policy relating to pupils defined as 'disaffected' has been negligible (Furlong 1991: 293). Furlong cites Connell who writes, "A weakness of much academic research is the product of two forms of occupational blindness - the inability of sociologists to recognise the complexities of the person and the unwillingness of psychologists to recognise the dimension of social power" (Connell 1987: 193-194). Sociology, as a discipline that attempts to explain the 'social', has almost disappeared from teacher training curricula, whilst educational psychology has maintained an hegemonic domination of approaches to social problems within schools (Galloway *et al.* 1982). Where sociology is drawn upon, for example, sociology of deviance is commonly used to explain 'disaffection' among young people, the focus is largely upon explaining problems in schooling by reference to macro sociological themes and perspectives.⁷¹ Education continues to be constrained within a positivist rationalism, as reflected in the governments' publication of school league tables (Croxford 1999).⁷²

Research into Exclusions from schools has not drawn upon Durkheim as a social theorist of collectivities. More recently, Furlong argues that sociologists of education turned to 'deviance' to draw upon Durkheim's notion of 'deviance' as a 'normal' aspect of everyday relations in order to explain 'disaffection from school' (Furlong 1991: 294). However, pupils continue to be referred to by the label 'disaffected', in which incidents of 'disaffection' are described, analysed and explained in reference to functionalist individualism. The character of rules at school is 'taken for granted', and actors are expected to 'follow rules'. This thesis argues schools are first and foremost social institutions constituted in a dialectical relation between 'institutional' order and 'informal' order; the first, as Chapter One argues that arises out of the bureaucratic demands of mass education, whilst the second necessarily arises out of everyday interactions among actors at school in their attempts to 'become somebody' (Wexler 1992).

⁷¹ See Brown, P. (1987) *Schooling Ordinary Kids: Inequality, unemployment and the new vocationalism*, London, New York, Tavistock Publications

⁷² The adequacy of league tables as a true reflection of pupils' achievements within a school is challenged within the teaching profession. Vigorous attempts to transcend this problem are reflected in the notion of 'value added' as a way of adjusting statistical statements, to take account of variations in socio-economic backgrounds of schools and their pupil intakes.

Sociological understandings of identity

Historically, 'identity' has been defined firstly in terms of self, selfhood, uniqueness, distinctiveness; and secondly, in social terms as accord, correspondence, empathy, rapport and sameness. Raymond Williams notes,

Until the 18th century individual was rarely used without explicit relation to the group of which it was, so to say, the ultimate indivisible division (Williams [1976] 1988: 163).

Sociological debates concerning the concept of 'identity', acknowledge their deep philosophical roots in Hegelian thought, but more recently symbolic interactionism, for example, in the work of C. H. Cooley (1902), G H Mead (1934), W. I. Thomas (1918), Erving Goffman (1959) and Stuart Hall (in Hall, Held and McGrew, 1992: 275-6) has contributed to shifts in conceptions of identity. The difficulty in defining 'identity' reflects sociology's conceptual difficulties in describing 'individual' experience as distinctive from 'social' experience in material life (Gilmore 1995: 464). Sociological debates about 'identity' map shifts in conceptions of human subjectivity as individual subjects to a more sociological definition that includes 'individual' subjects in relation to others. Citing Mead and Cooley, Hall describes the classical sociological subject as a,

... self, consciousness of 'self' as consisting of an 'inner' and 'outer' core and as having an "... identity ... formed in the 'interaction' between self and society (Hall, Held and McGrew 1992: 275).

Hall uses 'self' in the sense that Mead described a 'self' as capable of a,

... peculiar and distinctive character of interaction as it takes place between human beings. The peculiarity consists in the fact that human beings interpret or define each other's actions instead of merely reacting to each other's actions. Actors responses are not made directly to the actions of an other/s but instead are based on the meanings which they attach to such actions (Blumer 1962: 180).

A social 'identity' is thus described not as a given quality or attribute, but as constantly created and recreated in social interaction. Hall's work draws upon Goffman, to describe a sociological 'identity' as bridging the gap between the individual and his/her relation with the rest of society, by 'stitching' or 'suturing' the subject into social structures (Hall Held and McGrew 1992: 276).

Goffman's work establishes a notion of a multidimensional 'self'; Manning describes Goffman's 'identity' as having three distinct meanings,

A "social identity" is based upon relationships with other people. A "personal identity" is tied to the individual's personal biography. Finally, there is an "ego identity": this refers to an individual's subjective sense of him or herself as a result of various experiences (Manning 1992: 98).

Debates about 'identity' reflect a fusion of philosophical arguments about the problem of validating perceptions of 'ideas' and 'experience', and the emergence of a distinctive modern subject whose characteristics as a citizen arguably reflect his/her rights and obligations to participate fully in public life.

For Giddens, a post-modern identity is characterised more as a question of life style choices rather than as a coherent fixed and stable entity. McCrone describes Giddens elaboration of the post-modern argument as,

... offering opportunities and choices for individuals in a rapidly changing world ... lifestyle choice becomes more important in the constitution of identity, and, as a result, a new kind of lifestyle politics emerges from the shadow of 'emancipatory politics' (McCrone 1998).

Post-modern theorists write in a more iconoclastic vein, for example, Baudrillard refers to 'identities', a transition from history as a dialogue between people, where action is experienced in Goffman's 'dramaturgical' forms, to one where action which is experienced as 'communication' in the form of instantly available images and electronically produced text (Baudrillard 1987).

We no longer exist as playwrights or actors but as terminals of multiple networks ... These are processes where the stage which is no longer a stage becomes that of the infinitesimal memory and the screen (Baudrillard 1987: 16-17).

For Baudrillard, alienation is a thing of the past, all that is left for social theory is a rehashing of the ideas of the 'trinity', that is, Marx, Weber and Durkheim. In a 'postmodern' epoch, Baudrillard characterises relations in his concept of 'ecstatic communication'. Social life he would argue has become an experience of social networks and screen images. The 'self' of Mead and Goffman is displaced/replaced with astonishing speed. Images and styles and textual references are continually circulated and re-circulated in dramatic close-up, and some would argue its effects are deadly; the death of a princess whose place in the everyday lives of ordinary people, for example had/has a status of extraordinary significance.

Central concerns in a 'malestream' world of social theory are reflected in sociology's tendency to crisis regarding its explanatory task.⁷³ The collapse of positivism, a continuing absence of agreed general categories of theoretical adequacy and post-modern theor(ies) acceptance of many narratives, pose depressing questions for social theory. Holmwood argues "... *the challenge for social theory is to re-construct its explanatory categories, rather than to de-construct the explanatory undertaking*" (Holmwood 1995: 415). Later in the chapter, the difficulty of constructing an explanatory category so that it does not become distorted by old understandings in relation to it, is returned to; for example, 'masculinity' and its use as a category of 'identity'. Drawing upon data presented in substantive chapters, the issue of 'identity', conceptualised as a 'sociological' identity, is re-visited.

Interactionism

Drawing upon sociological conceptualisation of 'social identity', the next section describes a different formulation of the concept of the 'individual', its centrality in interactionism, and its logical impact upon notions of social order. What kind of an 'individual' is posited by interactionism? To answer to this question we turn to Goffman who draws upon Durkheim's vision of society. Goffman is argued to have abstracted from his famous and controversial case studies a general theory of interactionism. Goffman's conceptual insights are of relevance to this thesis, for Barnes (1995: 73) argues that Goffman shows how everyday interaction unfolds, for what general purposes, and how social sanctioning is accomplished in interaction.

Goffman's social theory, notoriously unsystematic in its presentation, reflects his interactionist standpoint. Goffman's micro sociology consists of case study research into wide and varied instances of 'face-to face' relations, which Goffman argues reveals general social processes.⁷⁴ Goffman's case studies are presented as illustrative of how generally social processes are thought to unfold in a whole range of different contexts and times and places. Drawing upon Mead's notions of an 'I'

⁷³ See a classic text by Alvin Gouldner (1970) *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*, London: Heinemann, in which Gouldner argues for social researchers to be 'reflexive' of their own practice, whilst acknowledging the capacity of lay social theorists to create explanations of their everyday lives.

⁷⁴ See E. Goffman's classic texts *Presentation of Everyday Self*, (1959) and *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*, (1963).

and a 'me' as an internal state, an individual is imagined as capable of orienting his/her reflective attention *inwards* towards 'self' and *outwards* towards 'others'. Interaction in a given historical time and place is thus experienced by actors on two planes, 'within self' and 'between self' and 'others'. A Meadian analysis suggests,

The organized community or social group which gives to the individual his unity of self can be called 'generalized other' (Mead G. H., [1934] 1967 *Mind Self and Society*: 135).

A crucial concept of 'social boundaries' as necessary for retaining a sense of separateness, draws attention to the 'social space' in relations among actors. Goffman (1975) presents concepts and ideas as formal theory, argued to be useful as an analytic frame across a whole range of social research through case studies.

Barnes, in reference to Tom Burns (1992) suggests that Goffman's concepts can be described under four main ideas. Goffman characterises 'society' as a *series of encounters*, or social interactions, where two or more people come together and act in ways that take notice of each other; every encounter is considered to be *special*; the interactionist individual is characteristically *non-independent*; put another way is *interdependent*, and finally the notion that "... orderly features of interaction can never be inferred wholly from pre-existing elements, whether of knowledge or competence, preference or desire, commitment or conviction" (Barnes 1996: 71). Barnes sums A. W. Rawls (1987) interpretation of Goffman as having identified a third social order, an interaction order *sui generis*.

The four points reveal important differences from individualist and functionalist or 'economic rationality' man, in how social order is thought to emerge.⁷⁵ Whilst for Parsons social norms are internalised and produce self-interested action influenced by reference to those norms, in Goffman's conception of 'society', what

⁷⁵The problem of rationality and intersubjectivity in Parsons social system approach to explaining social order, when linked to the problem of reflexivity, becomes the stuff of Garfinkel's criticism of his old teacher. Garfinkel's observations of jurors' decision making processes, suggested that Parsons view that actors acted from a set of internalised norms did not described how social order is secured. Heritage writes, "Garfinkel rejected the view that normative rules no matter how deeply they are internalised could in any way be determinative of conduct (Heritage 1984: 34). Heritage also writes, "Garfinkel wanted to understand the kind of order that constitutes mundane conduct based upon 'reasonable' considerations which are brought to bear in contexts of uncertainty, what kind of order is it and how does it work? " (Heritage 1984: 36).

individualism regards as independent operating units, and functionalism as a system of social institutions,⁷⁶ interactionism re-conceptualises as a multitude of *ongoing encounters* or interactions. Interactionist 'society' defines encounters between individuals *as special* as oriented each towards the other; each person can act and react to how he/she is treated, and through signs and signals (that is the human capacity for the 'significant gesture') he/she can rehearse and guess how the other might act in response to their treatment. Barnes makes the point that for Goffman,

... interactions are special because people are not objects ... to interact with them is not to act upon them in a purely *instrumental* sense (Barnes 1996: 70).

Barnes notes that Goffman's notion of special encounters points to Durkheim's social theory of 'society' and the sacredness of the individual in interaction.

Goffman's third basic idea defines individuals characteristically as *non-independent*, i.e., that people accommodate to each other in interaction to a greater or lesser degree, although some interactionists would go so far as to suggest that in interaction "... the nature of the individual is continually constituted and reconstituted in contexts of interaction" (Barnes 1996: 70). In terms of interpreting action, that is, actor's meanings and definitions of situations, this point raises significant epistemological and methodological problems. The notion of non-independence rejects the idea of individuals as having a fixed set of wants, or as acting from a set of internalised norms that are independent of the situation. The last point logically follows from the preceding three points, that orderly interaction cannot be wholly inferred from what has gone before. Whether reference is made to 'economic rationality' or assumed sets of norms,

... orderly features of interaction will remain unaccounted for, features engendered on the spot by agents facing the interactional demands, both general and particular, of the situation in which they find themselves (Barnes 1996: 71).

⁷⁶ I am reminded of Hobbes whose specific disregard of women's work in households did not recognise the **interdependence** of men's and women's relations. His physical comfort and orderly space were not secured by his direct contribution in his household so the idea of an individual as an 'independent operating unit' was evidently nonsense even at the time. Functionalism (see Parson's famous notion of the role of women in society) recognises the **interdependence** of men and women albeit by a division of labour that argued the emotional and physical needs of households were the natural work of women. By extension women as mothers in a functionalist account are assigned primary responsibility for the moral education of their children.

Interaction is revealed by Goffman's work to be a series of 'ritual interactions' between people, who through small gestures and ritual offerings, help create a sense of social life as having some solidity, order and predictability; of coping with what Marx famously called the characteristic feature of modernity, 'All that is solid melts into air.' Goffman argues that a degree of certainty about 'reality' is created through ritualistic 'face maintenance' and 'face saving' strategies used by actors as they monitor social interactions in attempts to avoid 'loss of face' and damage to personal esteem.

Goffman's theoretical usefulness in outlining an argument for social life as a series of meaningful 'encounters' within which a social 'self' is continually created and negotiated, is illustrated in the sociological literature through use of his concept of 'passing', as a way of managing a 'discreditable' or 'discredited' identity⁷⁷ (whether real or imagined, the stuff of school experience). Garfinkel (1967) ultimately critical of Goffman's formulation, used the idea of 'passing' as a way of managing a 'discredited' identity, in his famous study of Agnes. Manning (1992) describes how Garfinkel noted separate episodes of 'passing' in Agnes's accounts of preserving 'her' identity as a woman (Agnes was born a boy and had taken hormones in early adolescence). Garfinkel considered Goffman to have oversimplified interaction. Manning writes of Garfinkel's criticism of Goffman,

When taken individually, each of these episodes does seem to exemplify Goffman's ideas about passing and information control. However, Garfinkel argued that this approach oversimplifies the complexities of everyday behaviour. Specifically, it overlooks "inner time", during which we plan and anticipate, and reconsider our performance (Garfinkel 1967:166-7). If this time is added to the analysis, then passing becomes a continually unfinished project: we can never pass, we can only continue to work at passing (Manning 1992: 99-100).

Manning notes Garfinkel's view that 'passing' in cases of 'discredited' identity is never actually complete, but is a continuous, precarious and unending project, an insight that applies to social 'identity' formation as a continual process of creation of a socially acceptable identity. What is oversimplification for Garfinkel (1984) is **overlooked** in most everyday interactions; this level of complexity of interaction is

⁷⁷ See Goffman (1963) *Stigma*: 57 -128.

too introspective, *too time consuming*.⁷⁸ After *The Presentation of Self*, Goffman attempted to analyse background assumptions that sustain and reproduce trust among strangers (Manning 1992: 95). A Goffmanesque analysis shows the importance of 'trust' and 'face' in interaction; finally that social exclusion, as an outcome of failing to keep face, can in fact be defined as an 'event' in an ongoing process of exclusion for those with 'discredited' social identities. The usefulness of Goffman's insights are that the 'familiar' is not so much 'made strange', but 'slowed down' revealing the social complex character of social interaction. An analysis at this level has potential for understanding action as effecting social inclusion/exclusion in everyday encounters among social actors.

Social acceptance and 'self'

Literature examining macro-social struggles for inclusion, for example feminist struggles in this past century, describe social struggle in emancipatory terms as questions of social justice. However, Joel Anderson, translator of Axel Honneth's work, describes how the history of,

... social struggles of the last few decades have made clear, justice demands more than the fair distribution of material goods. For even if conflicts over interests were justly adjudicated, a society would remain normatively deficient to the extent that its members are systematically denied the recognition they deserve (Honneth 1995: x).

Anderson makes clear the importance of social recognition in terms of the human spirit, and cites Charles Taylor, who argues that "Due recognition is not just a courtesy we owe people. It is a vital human need... As one scarcely needs to add, it is also a need that has all too often gone unmet." Aristotle argued human beings are social beings; thus social relations are created out of human desire to be recognised, and in showing recognition to others.

⁷⁸ Heritage describes Garfinkel's analysis of the role of time in interaction, which critiques theories of action. Parsons, for example assumes that, "...the role of norms is essentially one of guiding, regulating, determining, or causing the conduct which may occur in *circumstances which are treated as if they are already pre-established or pre-fixed*." (Heritage, 1984: 108). Thus equipped actors are capable of producing joint action, and are argued to be unchanged by their courses of action. Heritage cites Garfinkel (1952: 147) who argues that the, "... role of time as an essential component in the unfolding succession of 'here-and-now' reconstitution of the actors' circumstances is ignored. ... time in the theory of action is treated as a 'fat moment'" (Heritage 1984: 108-109).

Honneth argues for an expansion of Mead's notion of 'self' in his concept of 'relation-to-self'. Honneth's concept consists of three aspects of a process by which we define 'self'; self-confidence, self-respect and self-esteem. For Honneth they represent three distinct species of 'practical relation-to-self'. Crucially, Honneth argues that'

One's relationship to oneself, ... is not a matter of a solitary ego appraising itself, but an *intersubjective* (his italics) process, in which one's attitude towards oneself emerges in one's encounter with an other's attitude toward oneself (Honneth 1995: xii).

Describing 'self' as emerging from a set of contested relations of various kinds, love and friendship, legal and communal in the sense of shared values, Honneth suggests that,

... these relationships are not ahistorically given but must be established and expanded through social struggles which cannot be understood exclusively as conflicts over interests. The 'grammar' of such struggles is 'moral' in the sense that the feelings of outrage and indignation driving them are generated by the rejection of claims to recognition and thus imply normative judgements about the legitimacy of social arrangements. Thus the normative ideal of a just society is empirically confirmed by historical struggles for recognition (Honneth 1995: xii).

Anderson describes Honneth as arguing, "... history is made less at the level of structural evolution than at the level of individual experiences of suffering and disrespect" (in Honneth 1995: xviii). Pupils frequently use the colloquialism "... it's a shame." (shame) to comment on the fact that some pupils actively prevent other pupils, perceived as having low social status, from participating in informal social activities at school. Pupils describe a socially *acceptable* identity as a key social need, to being able to, and/or allowed to participate in the everyday *informal* and *formal* relations at school.

Limits of interactionism

Interactionism provides a theoretical starting point, for understanding the 'social' in a Durkheimian sense of 'external and constraining'. Contrasted with positivism, interactionism allowed for social constructionism with respect to action.

Interactionism focused theoretical attention on the problem of *intersubjectivity* as a prelude to tackling interpretive questions which this perspective raises. Criticisms of interactionism are made in terms of its weakness in validating its findings, and in explaining structure, power and history, that Mills argues is sociology's 'task and its

promise' (1959). Sociological analyses attempt to account for relations among people within specific material contexts. As is so often quoted, sometimes without acknowledgement to Marx,

Man makes his own history, but he does not make it out of the whole cloth: he does not make it out of conditions chosen by himself, but out of such as he finds close at hand (Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonapart 1897: 9).

People live within whatever material conditions they may find themselves, and social interactions *are* shaped by material conditions. However, explanations of social problems are not necessarily reducible to material conditions. Actors in severe conditions of material deprivation nevertheless 'have to' agree or disagree about the social organisation and distribution of resources (Burgess 1983).⁷⁹ Common to most forms of relations, emotions and ideas are expressed to a greater or lesser degree in 'talk among actors'. The role of gestures and facial expressions adds to the complexity of communication. However, it is 'talk' that reflects upon 'action' and 'appearance' that largely creates connections between, to use Goffman's term, a range of 'encounters' (Goffmann 1959). Building upon Goffman's 'special encounter', and picking up Durkheim's notion of 'deviance' as normal and necessary to social integration, interactionism reveals everyday life as continually negotiated in talk (Strauss 1993). This chapter attempts to draw upon theoretical resources to allow the thesis to make links between a socially acceptable 'self' as constructed within mutually constituted processes of everyday talk about 'social norms' and 'rules' at school.

⁷⁹ This thesis addresses the problem of a disproportionate Exclusion of boys, relative to girls, from a pupils perspective, which is thus the main focus of the thesis. However, in Chapter Eight I briefly describe teachers' views about punishment and support, which show how different views shape decisions about the allocation and use of limited material and 'people' resources at school. Robert Burgess (1983: 192-194) writes about the experience of Newsom (Newsom Report, 1963) teachers, and their 'less able pupils'. The tone of what was to come for Newsom pupils was set on their first day. "At the beginning of the autumn term we faced reality. The abstract talk of timetables, pupils, syllabi and curricula were brought to bear on real pupils, in real classes... Much of the equipment which had been ordered during the previous term had not arrived, the rooms which were essential for practical work were not available and because of further modifications to the timetable, additional groups had been allocated to teachers for which there were no plans." Burgess's point is that the material and teacher provision for 'more able pupils' had taken precedence over the 'less able' pupils.

Social constitution of rules

Barnes points out that a sociological approach to rule making, associated implicitly with rule-breaking, is not a rejection of individual contributions,

... but addresses the claim that separate individuals are unable to act collectively, or to conform to rules or norms, or even to know what rules and norms specifically imply (Barnes 1996: 4).

According to individualism, collective action cannot exist, but imperfect though it may be,⁸⁰ clearly it does, as rules and norms created in discussion govern every aspect of human life. Barnes recognises the debt to the advancement of sociological theory that is owed to Parsons:

And it must be recognised that this account, by stressing how, everywhere, action will be found oriented to norms, values, rules, laws, conventions and so forth, has been of great service in the development of sociological theory (Barnes 1996: 53).

Barnes rejects Parsons account of 'normative order' and its stress on "... the internal relationship between the acting individual and the norm" (Barnes 1996: 53) to offer a necessarily schematic account of how we follow social norms and rules.

Reading Wittgenstein, Bloor outlines two "... fundamentally opposed approaches to rule following ... individualism and collectivism" in order to a) come to grips with the phenomenon of rule following and b) to defend a collectivist account of rules and a collectivist reading of Wittgenstein (Bloor 1997: 4). Bloor writes,

There are two competing schools of thought about the nature of rule following. One is usually called 'individualism', the other 'collectivism'. For the individualist, a rule in its simplest form is just a standing intention; for the collectivist, it is a shared convention or a social institution (Bloor 1997: ix).

Bloor notes that Wittgenstein does not succeed, nor anyone else for that matter, in refuting individualism. Considering the debate between individualism and collectivism with regard to rules is useful in the light it throws upon what rules are and how they come to be followed. Clearly an account of the character of rules, what they are and how are they made, is a useful theoretical task for this thesis. A

⁸⁰ See Barnes, B. (1996: 27-31) for a discussion on the 'free rider' problem in collective action.

critique of Wittgenstein or Bloor is not attempted, but their work is used to help analyse different kinds of rules referred to in the data. Bloor writes,

Individualists do not deny that many rules are designed to regulate social interactions (e.g. the rules of etiquette). The point they insist upon is that rule following as such doesn't necessarily or always involve interacting with other people. They express this by saying that rule following is not 'essentially social'... rule following is made possible by our power to grasp the meaning of the concepts used in the rules. Once we have grasped them, then it is their meaning which guides or determines our behaviour (Bloor 1997: 4).

Bloor gives as an example the rules involved in giving the sequence of even numbers, start with 2 and then add 2 to produce the next number of the sequence, and then add 2 to that, and so on ad infinitum. Bloor notes the language that we use in relation to rule following, and its normative character.

If we are going to follow the rule we *have to* say 14 after 12; we *must* do it this way if we are to obey the rule. This is how we talk: we say 'have to' and 'must', but, what do these words mean? ... where does the 'must' come from? ... the necessity we are dealing with is like a moral necessity: it is to do with getting something right or wrong, and of behaving well or badly according to some standard embodied in the rule... We are in the realm of norms... The mystery of compulsion is thus the mystery of normativity (Bloor 1997: 2).

For the individualist the meaning of a rule is already established, and Bloor notes that 'someone of a practical turn of mind' might be impatient with this kind of discussion; a rule is a rule and following it is not mysterious as its meaning derives from what has already been worked out. Bloor refers to the concept of 'meaning determinism'.⁸¹ In a philosophical account, rule following is made possible by our individual capacity to understand the ideas used in the rule. Heritage notes Garfinkel's 'breaching' experiments, which show how a lot of misunderstanding is created when 'taken for granted' statements are challenged in everyday interaction (1984: 103). Bloor writes of individualism's understanding of rules,

Once we have grasped them then it is their meaning which guides or determines our behaviour. Grasping a concept is a purely individual achievement. It is an individual mental act or it is nothing. If we can do it at all we can do it for ourselves and (at least in principle) by ourselves. Teachers and helpers, though useful in practice, are providers of hints and prompts rather than being logically necessary or involved by definition (Bloor 1997: 4-5).

⁸¹ For a fuller discussion about philosophical issues that 'meaning determinism' raises, see Bloor's 'Introduction' (1997: 4, footnote 2: 146).

The individual is thus considered to have been provided with standards of right and wrong for their rule following activity, standards that are implicit in the meanings of the ideas that make up the rule. Wittgenstein and Bloor both reject this understanding of rule following.

Wittgenstein argued for some curiosity as to how rule following can be investigated and understood more clearly and came to argue rules are socially constructed in talk that he calls a 'language game'. Rules for Wittgenstein are a form of collectivism. Bloor outlines Wittgenstein's collectivism in relation to rules under two propositions,

- 1) rules are social institutions or social customs or social conventions;
- 2) to follow a rule is therefore to participate in an institution and to adopt or conform to a custom or convention. As he put it: To obey a rule, to make a report, to give an order, to play a game of chess are customs (uses, institutions)' (PI: 199).⁸²

Bloor argues that the social character of rules is made mysterious because we are too close to them to recognise them for what they are, socially constructed formulations of how people are expected to act. However, to think this we could come to the view that once we have agreed the meanings of the ideas that make up a rule, for example, in a game of chess, then the logical implications are fixed and that the 'must' and 'have to' force of a rule lies in the consistency of meaning rather than in the underlying human customs and institutions that created them in the first place. A rule for Wittgenstein is a 'language game' and its meaning comes from its use by a collectivity. A rule defined as 'following' derives its meaning from the idea of a custom which implies regular use and does not imply a single episode by a single individual (Bloor 1997: 28). Bloor writes,

Wittgenstein's later philosophy ... was read by supporters and critics alike as a social theory. The claim was taken to be that the compulsion of rules comes from the shared language games in which they played a part. Wittgenstein's idea, that the meaning of sign came from its use, was taken to refer to a collective use and hence a collective body of users (Bloor 1997: 7).

⁸² See Bloor (1997: 9-26), for a deeper understanding of Wittgenstein's theory of rule following, which includes three dimensions; the individual, the sociological and 'meaning finitism'.

A rule thus emerges as reflecting the regularity of socially accepted practice. The activity of rule following and rule making defined as a social institution, is thus a fundamental component of more complex social institutions, for example a school, which points to the analytical significance of considering its socially constructed character.

Following Wittgenstein and Bloor's process of opening up the meaning of rules as a social institution, the next question must be; what does a social institution mean? Bloor notes Wittgenstein's use of the idea, but draws upon wider sources in the work of a philosopher, Anscombe⁸³ and a sociologist, Barnes⁸⁴ to outline an answer to the question, 'what is a social institution?' Bloor's concept emerges from a 'linguistic' approach to understanding social reality as rule following, in which actors collectively participate in a "... circle of talk about talk where the reference of the talk is the *practice* [my italics] of reference itself" (Bloor 1991: 32). Bloor offers practical examples to make his abstract point clear. Bloor writes, "Clearly, money is an institution, marriage is an institution, and property is an institution". The argument is then made that institutions of these kinds are created by thinking and talking that leads to a collective acceptance of a way of relating to the institution. For example, that a coin is accepted as a form of money does not lie in its material properties or its shape as a thing but in the fact of,

... how people regard it and employ it as a medium when interacting with one another. We must attend, not to the thing itself, the thing we call a 'coin', but to the people who call that thing a 'coin' ... metal discs *are* coins because they are *called* coins ... [Bloor's] reference to things being *called* 'coins' is shorthand for the entire repertoire of behaviour associated with their being thought of, or regarded as, or treated as a coin (Bloor 1991: 29).

The whole process of thinking and talking about an object and investing it with specific social meaning is compressed to an extent that ordinarily we are not

⁸³ Bloor refers to a range of philosophical literature: See G. E.M. Anscombe (1969) 'On promising and its justice and whether it need be respected *in foro interno*', *Critica* vol. 3 (reprinted in *Collected Papers*, 1981, vol. III: Chapter 2); (1976) 'The question of linguistic idealism', in *Acta Philosophica Fennica* vol. XXVIII: 188-215 (reprinted in *Collected Papers*, 1981, vol. I: Chapter 13); (1978a) 'On the source of authority of the state', *Ratio*, vol. 20: 1-28 (reprinted in *Collected Papers*, 1981, vol. III: Chapter 14); (1978b) 'Rules, rights and promises', *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* vol. 3: 318-323 (reprinted in *Collected Papers*, 1981, vol. III: Chapter 10).

⁸⁴ Bloor cites B. Barnes (1983) 'Social life as bootstrapped induction' *Sociology* vol. 4: 524-545.

consciously aware of the collective character of that process. Bloor writes. "The important point is that the group calling a certain type of object a coin, makes that object into a coin". The discussion depends upon an important distinction between 'social kinds' and 'natural kinds'. The latter are things that are not invented by people and have an independent existence of them, for example, trees, cats, etc. The former, 'social kinds', Bloor argues are things that are socially created, for example, coins, wives and houses are 'social kinds'. The social meaning attached to coins derives from a place in the social institution of money. If we stopped talking and using money the metal discs that serve as coins would cease to have meaning if the context of money were to vanish. Bloor goes on to make a case for his argument, that *thinking* and *talking* about money, marriage and property as institutions reveal a characteristic collective process where,

The logical circle derives from the fact that the whole discourse, the whole language game of calling something 'property', is a self referring practice. In virtue of it being a self-referring practice it is also a self-creating practice (Bloor 1991: 31).

The *content* of social agreement about a 'property' or 'marriage' or 'money' can only be defined by reference to the *idea* of it.

This leaves the question, where does the authority to call a coin a coin, or a married person married, or a property as owned by someone, come from? Again Bloor refers to the *social character of practice*, to argue authority is a social status, which has force because people socially accept authority. If no-one accepted the authority of the priest in terms of declaring persons as married, the priest would have no such authority. Arguably, proof of this point lies in the fact that marriage in church and even marriage, that is, a withdrawal of general social acceptance of the marriage ceremony, is associated with the demise of church authority, and its social relevance in relation to social arrangements among 'couples'. Formerly heterosexual family formations required a marriage certificate as a basis of its social acceptance. Durkheim (1925) argues that the compelling character of discipline, the 'must' and 'have to' referred to in Bloor's analysis, derives a moral authority from its social origins in the collective.

One final aspect of Bloor's argument must be put into place for the idea of a social institution to have practical application in analysing empirical data. How does a collective circle of self-referential talk begin, or rather who or what begins the circle of talk? Bloor refers to Barnes who called this the problem of 'priming' the system

and providing that some "... external trigger or stimulus can be found to 'prime' the system, social institutions can be analysed as self-referring systems of talk and thought" (Bloor 1991: 32). Drawing upon Austin's (1961) concept of 'performative utterances' Bloor argues 'a 'performative utterance' makes itself true by being uttered, so Bloor suggests, if someone says 'I greet you' it *is* to greet someone. That is, Bloor is saying because 'I greet you' has been *said*, in so saying it has been *done* [my italics]. What such a statement of this kind means, is a separate interpretive problem to solve. Thus Bloor argues his analysis of a social institution can be summed; social institutions can be treated as "... giant performative utterances" (Bloor 1991: 32). Bloor goes on to locate the self-referential and performative processes within Wittgenstein's rules and rule following as a regular pattern of action in social practice.

Bloor points to sociologists, Parsons for example, who have referred to norms as verbal maxims that are allegedly 'internalised' and thus determine behaviour. As 'normative determinism' Bloor argues that it is a form of 'meaning determinism' that obscures the *social processes* within which the meaning of a rule is derived. A sociological formulation of rule following requires a step back from the "... 'conventionalist' account of rules being accepted in a glib way without a clear sense of what is to be demanded of it". Bloor cautions, "It is no use assenting to the proposition that a rule is a convention, if convention is just another word for a rule" (Bloor 1991).

Barnes draws attention to the ways in which much rule and norm following is about learning local customs and practices that contribute to social conformity and co-operation that creates order in potentially innumerable different future interactions. The main point about social norms as reflected in custom and practices is that "... social norms are not decidable privately and separately by each and every individual". Barnes describes following a rule as extending an analogy, that is,

When an individual seeks to follow a norm or rule, she acts in a way learned by familiarity with previous accepted instance or examples. The intention is to act in proper analogy with those examples ... to follow a rule or norm is to extend an analogy. To understand rule-following or norm-guided behaviour in this way immediately highlights the formally open-ended character of norms ... that there is no logical compulsion to follow them in any specific way (Barnes 1996: 55).

Barnes describes three important theoretical aspects of what is involved in following a rule that logically follow from an interactionist account of 'society'. An individual

who is rule following, acts by extending an analogy; action is roughly by reference to the last time with respect to the rule. It follows that to understand rules in this way is to see them as open-ended and that they of themselves cannot fix and determine what actions conform to them. As an analogy does not constitute identity, Barnes argues that rules understood in this way mean that it is up to an individual to decide where a rule applies and to what extent it applies.

Barnes identifies three theoretically significant aspects of what is involved in 'deciding on the spot' on whether a rule, as an analogy, has been followed. His view has resonance in terms of rule breaking/following in school, Barnes writes,

... we focus attention on ... the formal, the psychological/behavioural and the social/collective dimensions. Otherwise, it can be difficult to retain full awareness of what is involved and in particular the crucial collective dimension may be overlooked (Barnes 1996: 56-57).

Three important points emerge if individuals follow norms in this way. First an individual is "*formally* unconstrained by the norm she intends to follow". Nevertheless, the individual will be contingently affected by chance in the sense that action can only be shaped by her knowledge of earlier examples of following the rule. When conforming to a rule or norm this action may be done automatically,⁸⁵ but however automatic an action may be, it is always possible for it to be criticised. "It can always be asked whether what she does routinely in relation to the norm is done correctly" (Barnes 1996: 56). If Barnes' view is correct then any action with respect to a rule or social norm is criticisable by others, thus a statement about whether or not a rule or norm has been followed takes an actor's own view and other people's views about action into account.⁸⁶

Importantly, Barnes illustrates the inherent ambiguous character of rule following by reference to the legal process. In recognition of the ambiguity that surrounds any action, for example it is possible for a person convicted of assault to appeal against a judge's pronouncement, Barnes goes on to say that this way of understanding how we follow rules opens up the possibility of seeing the 'routiness' of rule following as

⁸⁵ Barnes (1996: 56) gives the example of a drill sergeant calling troops to attention.

⁸⁶ Habermas' (1967) formulation of this argument is 'acted upon' later in the thesis.

a conforming collective enterprise, in which 'existing practices' suggest future practice.

In confirmation of Garfinkel's earlier findings, in a dispute about rule following, a search for a "real meaning" of a social norm or rule reveals the inadequacy of seeing a rule as "... externally given - by the meaning of the norm itself as it were" (Barnes 1996: 57). What counts as following a rule or social norm correctly becomes better defined as a statement that emerges from a process of discussion about action between actors. As Barnes writes,

Either way, whether the norm continues routinely as a matter of course or by active negotiation, as must often be the case, the norm remains necessarily and irreducibly a *public* (Barnes' italics) entity not a private one; it exists as agreement in practice not as an instruction in an individual mind (Barnes 1996: 57-58).

Rule making and rule following formulated as on-going negotiation of action is consistent with interactionism. If, as Barnes points out that, "Conforming to norms is a collective activity" (1996: 157), then everyone contributes to rule formation to a greater or lesser degree. This thesis argues for a rejection of individualist and functionalist accounts of action, as these explanations for social integration lead inexorably towards a theory of punishment for those defined as rule breakers; whereas, rules formulated as practice leave open the possibility of theory of Exclusions formulated as a series of on-going negotiation of dis/agreements about action. Strauss *et al* (1964) define rules as a 'negotiated order' and rules are either formal (codified laws) or informal (tacit agreements). Wittgenstein describes rules as social practice,

And hence also 'obeying a rule' is a practice. And to *think* one is obeying a rule is not to obey a rule. Hence it is not possible to obey a rule 'privately': otherwise thinking one was obeying a rule would be the same thing as obeying it (Ludwig Wittgenstein 1968).⁸⁷

Wittgenstein would disagree with Strauss and would not use terms like 'vague' or 'ambiguous' to define a rule. For Wittgenstein, a rule is formally defined and is a rule. Rules theoretically formulated as practice illuminate empirical discussion between actors as response to action that challenges rules and social norms.

⁸⁷ See Ludwig Wittgenstein (1968) *Philosophical Investigations* Translated by G.E.M. Anscombe Basil Blackwell: Oxford. Part 1, paragraph 202).

Durkheim describes rules as emerging from a process of 'adaptation' within relations which becomes,

... a rule of conduct only if the group consecrates it with its authority. A rule, is not only an habitual means of acting; it is, above all, *an obligatory means of acting*; (Durkheim's italics) which is to say, withdrawn from individual discretion (Durkheim, Preface to the second edition, *The Division of Labour in Society*: 4).⁸⁸

Social action, observed and experienced by the collectivity as a challenge to rules or social norms, is taken as evidence of social dis/order which demands social attention. Social action can be formulated as difference in 'appearance' and/or 'action' which in effect challenges corresponding rules and/or social norms to which the example refers. Difference among social actors can thus be defined as failing to conform to socially accepted rules and norms. Challenge can be defined as a *difference of opinion*, as a matter of interpretation of rules and regulations that define relations within a specific context. Challenge in whatever form, often arises as an expression of deeply felt emotions about the fairness or relevance of rules and regulations, which act as *negatively* constraining negotiations of relations among actors. Social difference is frequently defined in essentialist terms, and when 'action' or 'identity' are defined by a social majority as negative the person is labelled as deviant.

In the schools in which this research was conducted, gender stereotype descriptors were used by pupils and teachers, to make general statements about boys and girls, or put another way, within the context of formal rules of interaction, essentialist gender stereotypes were used as normative referents in negotiating everyday rules of interaction. The next section briefly outlines sociological understandings of 'gender', its sub categories 'masculinity' and 'femininity', and draws upon authors who research gender in relation to schools.

⁸⁸ At this point it would be possible to turn to discussions of social power to support an analysis of evident differential exercise of power by pupils in comparison to teachers in debates about rules. However, it is important to follow the line of argument that explores what kind of social processes we are dealing with and how they are interconnected.

Transformations of gender in modernity

In modernity, knowledge production about the social world, and criteria by which the validity of knowledge is judged is measured by reference to standards of rationality set in opposition to nature. Seidler writes,

Descartes set the terms for the opposition between reason and nature. As mind was set in opposition to matter, so was reason set in opposition to nature... But our thinking is essentially disembodied and disconnected from our emotional lives that have their grounding in the life of a body (Seidler 1994: 7).

Within early social and political discourses sexual difference was set up in terms of the 'monologue' of the universal 'man' whose knowledge of the natural and by extension the social world was expressed in terms of a 'natural' dichotomy (Sydie 1987: 1-11).⁸⁹ Modern accounts of social relations are represented as duality; between female, associated with nature and irrationality, and male associated with rationality and culture. Arguably generic notions of 'man-the-measure of culture' transcends relations between men and women as connected through sexual relations (Connell 1987, 1995).⁹⁰ Criteria for measuring rationality and thus knowledge itself is in crisis. Rationality is strongly associated with the concept 'masculine' and it too appears to be in crisis, as reflected in its failure to accommodate the lived experiences of men. Feminist sociological critique of social theory presents radical theories of gender that show its impact on social inquiry

⁸⁹ Connell (1987: 112) notes, historically and cross-culturally sexual attachment has not always been organised in terms of a dichotomy. Freud produced the psychoanalytic method of research, with a life history as the unit of analysis. Enlightenment ideas infused Freud's 'biological orientation' to understanding human beings. Sex, sexuality and the notion 'penis envy', are central themes in Freud's psychoanalytic understanding of individual emotional growth within a context of significant social relationships. Freud's noting of 'bisexual' experience began the theoretical challenges to the adequacy of the concepts 'woman' and 'man' as universal explanatory concepts. Sydie writes, "In fact, many men ... failed to live up to the 'masculine ideal' and ... all human individuals, as a result of their bisexual disposition and of cross inheritance, combine in themselves both masculine and feminine characteristics, so that pure masculinity and femininity remain theoretical constructions of uncertain content (Sydie 1987: 129). Freud argued that gender is a contradictory structure and Sydie notes Freud's concept of 'bisexuality' brought the notion of dichotomy into doubt as an adequate way of conceptualising human experience.

⁹⁰ Connell R.W. (1987) attempts to unpack the complicated intellectual history of gender and its associated concepts of 'masculinity' and 'femininity', by tracing their early roots in psychology, biology and psychoanalytic accounts of gender..

generally; social relations are characterised as 'gender relations' (Connell 1987: 37; Finch 1993).

Feminist sociologists argued social relations to be 'political relations' that are mediated through a range of social institutions, many of which act for the state (Sydie1987).⁹¹ Currently, social outcomes for men and women continue to be shaped by the social organisation of everyday experience along a private/public sphere split.⁹² Academic explanations assumed heterosexual dimorphism, that the world is made of men and women as natural entities that are defined one (man) in relation to the other (woman).⁹³ Feminism and feminist theory raised the issue of the social position of women as subordinate to men⁹⁴ and men's use of power in relations between men and women.⁹⁵ Attempts to draw upon evident social and cultural differences in social arrangements challenged assumptions of "... the pre-existence of any masculinity" (Hearn cites Meigs 1990; Herd 1994; Butler 1990).

Disproportionate levels of male relative to female Exclusion from school contradicts feminism's general claim that women's social position is characteristically male dominated in terms of access to material resources in all societies (Young 1983: 129).

⁹¹ See Sydie R. A. (1987: 95-123) for a good overview of Marx and Engels views on the family, the labour debate and their connections with capitalism, patriarchy and the state. Parsons, for example drew upon biological/natural arguments regarding notions of gender, without critical appraisal of the gendered assumptions embedded within them. Feminist scholars coined the term 'male stream' social theory, partly in criticism of Parsons's concepts of 'instrumental man' and 'expressive woman'. Coinciding with 1950's and 1960s conservative notions of gender, Parsons conceptualisation of gender had great social power and effect in the organisation of a range of institutions in social life, not least the family and the school. See Connell, R.W. (1987: 41- 65) for a detailed linking of three main theoretical feminist approaches to current 'male stream' social explanations.

⁹² See MacInnes, J. (1998: 7-12) for a good discussion of contradictions within arguments about 'difference' between the sexes in modernity as socially constructed or 'naturally' derived.

⁹³ Discourses of feminism are thus largely about a rejection of being excluded by definition, as 'other' in relation to men. See Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, first published in 1949, for the emergence of philosophical discussions about 'women' defined as 'other'. This work provided a philosophical foundation for feminist scholarship.

⁹⁴ See, Connell, R.W. (1987: 23 -37) for an overview of the relationship between conventional theory and the academic process of theorising gender, and Walby, S. (1990) who addresses theoretical problems posed by 'patriarchy'.

⁹⁵ See for example, Barrett, M. (1980) *Women's Oppression Today*.

The social experience of Excluded boys cannot be addressed within a category of 'masculinity' defined by its apparent dominance in terms of 'patriarchal' social power. Girls too are Excluded; but female Exclusion is of a different character for girls in comparison to that of boys. In descriptions of action between people at school, pupils and teachers make normative statements about how they present a gendered 'self' in interactions at school. The overall approach of this thesis to empirical problems associated with men and boys, is that they cannot be explained in terms of concepts of 'behaviours' and 'masculinity/ies' ('identities' are the outcome of 'negotiated order'). Rather explanations of empirical problems associated with boys or men must make reference to rules/norms that govern everyday relations. In everyday statements and negotiations, essentialist understandings of 'masculinity' and 'femininity' act as descriptions of how people, men as 'masculine' and women as 'feminine', 'ought to' act in their social relations. It is important to note, both statements of gender equality *and* essentialism are used as 'should' referents when explaining in/discipline at school.

Psychological genesis of gender

Influenced by Freud's detailed analyses of 'masculinity' and 'femininity', psychologists searched for biological explanations to establish psychological differences between men and women. Drawing upon biological categories 'male' and 'female', psychology assumed a unitary set of traits as characteristic of,

... women and men as groups (who) have different temperaments, characters, outlooks and opinions, abilities, even whole structures of personality (Connell 1987:167).

Psychology claimed 'scientific' status for such accounts of gender. Citing Constantinople's summing-up in 1977 on psychology's ongoing attempt to identify 'masculinity' and 'femininity' through a method of scales, Connell wrote, "... both theoretically and empirically they seem to be among the muddiest concepts in the psychologist's vocabulary" (Connell 1987: 174). MacInnes cites Freud's view that, "the concepts of "masculine" and "feminine" ... are amongst the most confused that occur in science" (MacInnes 1998: 15). Nevertheless, characterised as methodological individualism, psychological approaches to gender attempted to measure gender,

for example, in Bem's Sex Role Inventory (Bem 1977).⁹⁶ In this view 'masculinity' is individually possessed as a thing-in-itself (Hearn 1996: 207). Connell argues in psychological research, reification of 'masculinity' and 'femininity' emerged as a safer research approach based upon methods of natural science research that draw upon formal measurement and statistical proof.⁹⁷

Connell draws attention to psychological methods of empirical research into 'masculinity' and 'femininity', to argue a methodological view and its methods shape what is being researched and how findings of 'it' come to be reported. Connell's argument is of great significance in supporting arguments for sociological critique of gender as 'natural' and 'taken as given' as it reveals non-reporting of findings that would fail to support unitary models of gender as explanation. These findings are not formulated as challenge to ontological assumptions of 'masculinity' and 'femininity'. Connell illustrates ways in which 'significance testing' itself creates the dynamic of research interest in finding block differences between men and women,

... since what is tested is not its size or psychological importance, but simply the probability that there exists some difference which is not the result of chance. The kind of conclusion that passes from the journal articles into the textbooks and popular-psychology best sellers is that 'women have higher verbal ability' or 'men are more aggressive'. If a statistically significant block difference does not emerge, the researcher is likely to be disappointed and the research may not get published, since it seems to have nothing to say... (Connell 1987: 169).

⁹⁶ Connell outlines Bem's creation of a scale which purported to measure individuals' sense of their masculinity or femininity across 20 measures of beliefs of the appropriateness of certain specific personality characteristics for a man (masculinity) and a woman (femininity). Bem dispensed with the notion of range, to devise an 'androgyny' scale, which simply requested that people rate themselves in relation to a trait, for example, "... ambitious, forceful," (1987 : 172). Connell cites Spence and Helmreich's, *Masculinity and Femininity*, as another example of the tradition in psychological work into gender, which uses masculinity/femininity scales. In this research people were invited to rate themselves in relation to a scale presented in terms of extremes, from " ... *very rough**very gentle*." (1987: 171).

⁹⁷Burr. V. (1995) locates the emergence of social constructionism in psychology in the work of K.J. Gergen and M.M. Gergen circa 1985, which suggests the transformative effects of the concept and arguments associated with social construction came relatively late to the discipline of psychology.

Drawing strongly upon biological categories of 'male' and 'female' as bodies naturally associated with 'masculinity' and 'femininity' as unitary traits having explanatory power, researchers focus attention upon the inadequacy of method and sample rather than doubting the adequacy of 'masculinity' and 'femininity' (Connell cites Parsons and Bales 1956; Chodorow 1978; Brownmiller 1975).

Connell argues 'masculinity' in modernity is a disembodied concept applied to a type of person. Connell writes, the

... concept of masculinity ... in its modern usage ... assumes that one's behaviour results from the type of person one is. That is to say, an unmasculine person would behave differently: being peaceable rather than violent, conciliatory rather than dominating, hardly able to kick a football, uninterested in sexual conquest, and so forth (Connell 1995: 67).

It is clear from this definition, 'unmasculine' can refer to a male or female, and that in modernity 'behaviour' is conceptualised as associated with a 'type' of person. MacInnes notes that students asked to imagine 'masculinity' as an essence, produce a list of characteristics, which were immediately qualified,

... this list is stereotypical and does not correspond fully to any actually existing man they know. They also concede that none of these qualities can only be possessed by men and that many women have demonstrated them too; discussion usually turns to Margaret Thatcher (MacInnes 1998: 14).

MacInnes refers to 'sex difference' research carried out over the past hundred years as showing relatively little direct connection to having a male or female body. Theorising gender in ways that emphasised sex differences and sex-role socialisation, lead to conceptual and political problems as in effect it reified social and cultural specificity (Eichler 1980).

Normative meanings in concepts of gender

Erik Erikson's (1950) influential psychoanalytic concept 'gender identity' claimed to provide research into gender with a model of emotional development. In association with psychiatrist Robert Stoller's (1968) 'core gender identity' as created in childhood within emotional interactions between a child and his/her parents, gender was theorised in normative terms. Connell cites Robert May (1980; 1986) who roundly criticised Erikson and Stoller , and

... question(ed) whether this is a psychoanalytic theory at all. May argues that Erikson's approach is really a meliorist ego psychology, and Stoller's concept

of 'core gender identity' has lost essential psychoanalytic insights about conflict, fantasy, and the unconscious (Connell 1995: 15).

Stoller's work is "... unquestionably ... normalizing theory" (Connell 1995: 15).⁹⁸ Essentialist notions of 'gender identity' are evident in the practice of 'consciousness raising' adopted by feminists, and more lately by the men's movement, and in 'gender-role therapy', which drew upon 'sex-role' theories. Connell considered analyses of 'sex-role' theory important to note as accounts reveal the "... basis of constraints in stereotyped interpersonal expectations" (1987: 48).⁹⁹ Connell writes, "... behaviour and expectation is basic to the role metaphor " an important distinction, which created difficulties for theorists from a sex-role perspective who were criticised for a neglect of power, either contingently or inherently, in male relations (1995: 27).

Search for 'identity' and 'sex-role' 'looked for' evidence of 'real woman' and 'real man' as therapeutic objectives in attempts to help people accept 'nature's way'.¹⁰⁰ Connell considers these ideas as belief in "... a fixed, true masculinity beneath the

⁹⁸ Oakley, A. (1972) famously drew upon Stoller's work to draw a sociological distinction between 'sex' as biology and 'gender' as social. Writing from a relatively rare historical approach to gender, Tolson refers to Oakley's distinction, "This definition of gender allows us to appreciate the highly particular ways in which 'masculinity' is commonly understood ... 'masculinity' is not simply the opposite of 'femininity' but there are many different types of gender identity ... and different expressions of masculinity with and between different cultures" (1977: 12).

⁹⁹ Criticism of role theory, rejected as internally incoherent in its argument, raised doubt with regard to Parsons's views on gender. Parsons's response to empirical criticisms of 'instrumental' man and 'expressive' woman, was rejected on historical grounds, as 'homosexuality' conceptualised as 'role strain' "... was and is institutionalised in some societies" (Carrigan *et al.* 1985: 556, 579).

¹⁰⁰ See Gagnon J. H. and Simon W. (1974) for a ground breaking sociological work in understandings of sexuality as social constructed. Gagnon & Simon approached sexuality using a dramaturgical metaphor of a script, where sexuality is defined as those aspects of the body and desire that are linked to the erotic. Plummer nicely sums the context of this relatively new way of defining sexual conduct, "In contrast to the clinicians, whose prime focus is the unconscious, the book-keepers, whose prime focus is behavioural frequency, and the experimentalists, whose prime focus is sexual physiology, the concern of this tradition is with sexual meaning and the way it is socially constructed and socially patterned" (Plummer 1982: 224) Plummer argues a social constructionist definition of sexual conduct draws a distinction between material bodies, and what bodies do in sexual experience, which allows for discussion about the normative meanings that come to be assigned to different forms of sexual conduct. This distinction is the basis of sexual politics and by extension, a basis for gender to be conceptualised as practice (1982: 223-241).

ebb and flow of daily life... the 'deep masculine' " (1995: 45), beliefs accepted *despite considerable contradictory evidence* from people who live as transsexuals. Whose or what interests are best served by these contradictory beliefs? Importantly, Eichler writes, "... a norm is always a 'should' statement not an 'is' statement, and at some point the 'is' is judged in terms of the 'should'" (1980: 51). Drawing upon Eichler (1980), Hearn argues that "... masculinity effectively acts as a normative and indeed culturally specific standard" (Hearn 1996: 203). Hearn argues that as descriptions of what 'masculinity' and 'femininity' consist of, psychological traits were used in gender studies on identity, sex-role socialisation, gendered behaviours, psychoanalysis, analyses of power and institutional practices, in which 'masculinity' acts as a referent point against which behaviours and identities can be evaluated (Hearn 1996: 203).

'hegemonic' masculinity'

General crisis in social theory led to Connell and other social theorists critique of 'masculinity' and its subsequent development (Connell 1993b). Carrigan, Connell and Lee summarised critiques of 'role' theory, 'sex' role theory, including 'Parsons' role strain', to outline three main forms of masculinity evident in social practice; 'hegemonic', homosexual,¹⁰¹ and transsexual (Carrigan *et al.* 1985). As a bench mark for definitions of gender in modernity, Gramsci's concept of 'hegemony' central to his analyses of class relations, is reformulated by Connell to create the concept 'hegemonic masculinity'. Connell writes,

In the concept of hegemonic masculinity, 'hegemony' means ... a social ascendancy of achieved in a play of social forces that extends beyond contests of brute power into the organization of private life and cultural processes. Ascendancy of one group of *men* (my italics) over another achieved at the point of a gun, or by the threat of unemployment, is not hegemony. Ascendancy which is embedded in religious doctrine and practice, mass media content, wage structures, the design of housing, welfare/taxation policies and so forth, is (Connell 1987: 184-185).

Connell distinguishes two points, "First, though 'hegemony' does not refer to ascendancy based on force, it is not incompatible with ascendancy based on force ...

¹⁰¹ Historically, the 'homosexual' emerged in the late 19th century as an 'identity' or a 'type of person'. The social organisation of that identity becomes clear once a theoretical distinction is drawn between homosexual 'behaviour' and homosexual 'identity' (See Carrigan *et al.* 1985).

Second that 'hegemony' does not mean total cultural dominance" (1987: 184). Connell's re-formulation of Gramsci's definition is important for gender as it clearly suggests that 'hegemony' is associated with ascendancy in relation to public power. Connell states, "... Hegemonic masculinity is very public" (1987: 185). Connell distinguishes between the notion of a general 'male sex role' and drawing upon sex-role literature reiterates the point that the cultural idea of 'masculinity' is not necessarily associated with actual personalities of the majority of men (1987: 184). However, he does write *men* and public power is not *necessarily* associated with male persons.

Connell's use of 'hegemonic masculinity' is linked as having a 'fit with' 'emphasised femininity' as a form of 'gender relations' between men and women, a conceptualisation of gender as dichotomy that does little to help transcend Enlightenment categories (Connell 1987: 183-186). Defined by reference one with the other, it is without doubt that 'women' were traditionally defined as 'other', and conceptualised as different from and inferior to 'men'. Simone de Beauvoir's defining statement illustrates this point; she writes,

One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman. No biological, psychological, or economic fate determines the figure that the human female presents in society; it is civilisation as a whole that produces this creature, intermediate between male and eunuch, which is describe as feminine (de Beauvoir 1949 [1983]: 296).

Connell locates 'emphasised femininity' as a public form of femininity, although he argues its content is specifically linked to the bedroom. Connell's concept 'emphasised femininity', however is a referent in mass social relations, which reflects a common form of femininity evident among women in their social relations with men. 'Emphasised femininity' defines women as compliant within their social subordination to men, and whose relations with men are characterised as accommodating the interests and desires of men (1987: 183). Connell draws upon Irigaray (1981), to support his view; she argues there has been no clear-cut definition for women's eroticism and imagination in patriarchal society (1987:183). Other forms of 'femininity' are argued to consist in various combinations of strategies of resistance and non-compliance. Connell's analyses of relations between women lead him to write,

Power, authority, aggression, technology are not thematized in femininity at large as they are in masculinity. Equally important, no pressure is set up to

negate or subordinate other forms of femininity in the way hegemonic masculinity must negate other masculinities (Connell 1987: 187).

Jane Austen's novel's, written in self-conscious awareness of capitalism and its social effects, reflect female characters whose forms of femininity emerge in capitalistic conditions of limited access to paid employment. Modernity sharpened women's reliance upon their capacity to attract a man with paid employment as a necessary way of securing material survival. Evans writes,

As if to emphasise this point, Jane Austen ... provides ... minor characters, who often play little part in the central narrative and yet stand as embodiments of the fate of women handicapped by poverty or social stigma (Evans 1987: 8).

Austen's sexual relations are heterosexual in form, as illustrated by Mrs Bennett's desperate attempts to marry off her five 'unprovided for' daughters. Poor women can be contrasted with Emma,

... handsome, clever, and rich, with a comfortable home and happy disposition, seemed to unite some of the best blessings of existence; and had lived nearly twenty-one years in the world with very little to vex and distress her (Jane Austen, *Emma*, Chapter 1: 37).

Austen reveals the 'hegemonic femininity' of her times. This form of femininity supported by Mrs Bennett, is necessarily embraced by Emma in her quest for Mr Knightly. As Connell argues that "At the mass level ... [femininities] are organised around themes of sexual receptivity in relation to younger women and motherhood in relation to older women" (1987: 187). Austen herself is nevertheless representative of the inexorable flow of women into the modern public domain.

In practice, 'hegemonic masculinity' is characterised as domination of women as institutionalised, as heterosexual and as historically situated and largely although not exclusively in the public domain (Carrigan *et al*, 1985: 593). Relations of 'hegemonic masculinity' require 'persuasion' to organise a sexual division of labour, or put another way, to define work as 'women's work' and 'men's work'. Hegemony is linked to inherently socially stratified forms of social inequality and in association with 'masculinity' the gendered character of social power becomes clear.

Men and 'masculinity'

Feminist social inquiry into the social position of women has revealed the extent to which 'actual' men exercise power in violent ways. The concept of 'masculinity' has

been challenged because it too has negative associations with violence as a form of power used to enforce a gendered social organisation and practice, arguably to the general social and material benefit of men.¹⁰² Men who attempted to understand why men dominate in so many areas of social life, turned to create a new historical account of those areas of men's social experience which was arguably missing from existing histories. Connell notes, "The central theme of a new men's history ... what was missing from the non-gendered history of men (was an) - idea of masculinity" (1995: 28). Thus, despite all the evidence against essentialist explanations as adequate for explaining social action, concepts of 'men' and 'maleness' and 'masculinity', become conflated with 'actual' men whose actions are considered to be a problem of maleness.

In attempting to explain 'masculinity' and 'actual' men, social theorists drew on three main discourses essentialist, experiential and positivist.¹⁰³ Common to all three is an inherent normative position. Male social theorists interested in the topic of gender want to disassociate themselves from negative representations of 'men', 'maleness' and 'masculinity'. Male social theorists variously seek to understand male experience, for example, through theoretical engagement and others through 'consciousness raising' (Blauner 1996: 166). Problems of methodology, general to social science, are bedevilled by old forms of knowledge, which reproduce problems in terms of its original categories. In disassociating themselves from negative representations of 'men', 'maleness' and 'masculinity', male theorists have attempted to re-construct a 'new man'.

¹⁰² Social theorists interested in exploring feminist challenges to men, have rejected the notion of the overall hegemony of men in modern society. Bob Blauner's review essay of Connell's *Masculinities*, suggests that most theorists of men's consciousness who identify as profeminists, make empirical observations of the world from the premise that power is a basic assumption " ... and specifically male power over women" (Blauner 1996: 167). Blauner argues however that " ... in terms of the ability to have a real impact on the world and on the institutions of the larger society... not more than 10 percent of *white* men in the United States are powerful " (Blauner 1996: 168). Importantly, Blauner raises the question of differentiated male access to social power and resources. Connell's response to Blauner is that , "... given the evidence of men's greater incomes, control of wealth, state power, cultural authority and access to the means of violence (Connell 1996: 174), is to reiterate aggregate social inequality of women and to argue that considerations of male power are central theoretical and empirical questions to be addressed.

¹⁰³ See for example the men's consciousness raising movement which draws upon the work of Robert Bly, and his text *Iron John*.

MacInnes wishes to dissociate actual men and women from conceptual understandings of 'masculinity', 'femininity' and 'gender' as *properties of persons* (MacInnes 1998: 15). MacInnes existential argument draws upon men's formal status as consistent with women's formal status as evidence; he writes,

Yet compared even to 50 years ago, let alone two centuries ago men in contemporary industrial capitalist societies have few public rights, if any which they enjoy by virtue of their sex (MacInnes 1998: 16).

MacInnes locates his argument regarding social inequality of women relative to men, within a psychoanalytic framework that outlines processes of individuation, as linked to the social construction of that process by the fact of having a male or a female body. He argues that

We have come to systematically confuse what results from us all being born *of* a man *and* a women with what results from us all being born *as* a man *or* a women, so that the natural limits to our social identities come to appear to be the fact that we are all born *of one sex or another* (my italics) rather than being set by the inexorable fact that we are the products of biological sexual reproduction. We enter the world as helpless, socially incapable infants, utterly dependent on our carers... (MacInnes 1998: 17).

MacInnes in one sentence is attempting to make a universal narrative of conception and birth fit with a social contract that argues that all men (in the generic sense) are equal. Empirical problems arising from sexual divisions of labour argued to be unfair to women have moved beyond arguments regarding principles of equality between men and women, neither are they problems of establishing whether children are born "... *of one sex or another*" (MacInnes is casting theoretical red herrings to suggest that we might be born of men or women!). In modernity, the problem is precisely who is going to care for the "... helpless, socially incapable infant utterly dependent on ..."? The politically correct reply is the baby's carers, but in the middle of the night when all the world is still, the sound of a baby's cry has traditionally and largely continues to wake up his/her mother.¹⁰⁴ Social arrangements of divisions of labour in households impact upon actual persons and

¹⁰⁴ For a discussion of the social arrangements in modernity that led to the institutionalisation of motherhood see Adrienne Rich, 1997, *Of Woman Born*. My initial introduction to academic feminism was through a reading of this text, a point which endorses Connell's view that much of the power of feminism lay in the fact that "Contemporary feminism, at least self-identified feminism, is a highly literate political movement... To become a feminist does not absolutely require a higher degree in literature but it is certainly usual that someone becoming a feminist will read a lot" (Connell 1993: 99).

their availability for participating in divisions of paid labour in public institutions. Social arrangements for babies and young children provide the sharpest test of the state of actual gendered relations *within* and *between* private and public domains.¹⁰⁵

Sociological debates about gender and the conceptual emergence of 'gender relations' are embedded in debates about sexual politics and a persistence of social inequality for women relative to men (Connell 1995; Connell 1996; Finch 1993). McMahon writes, "Masculinity seems to hold sway over men, just as sex roles did in earlier formulations. Barbara Ehrenreich noted how the 'male role' became an explanatory cliché in academic and popular accounts of men. It is possible that 'masculinity' is suffering the same fate" (McMahon 1993: 691). In relation to time and space, the concept of 'masculinity' may not be the most appropriate concept to describe and analyse an individual within particular social situations, "Masculinity applied inappropriately can be a misleading and confusing concept, as that *what* is not seen" (Hearn's italics) (Hearn 1996: 210). Authors argue that formal equality between the sexes signals an end of the significance of masculinity as a concept (MacInnes 1998).

Lack of evidence of significant empirical change and the failure of the 'new man', is worrying for those interested in eradicating social inequality of women relative to men, particularly around the issue of violence.¹⁰⁶ In the context of a 'still-male-dominated' social science discourse, McLennan, writes,

(I)t is clear that feminism now carries considerable legitimacy within the human sciences and within radical thought generally. Indeed, in some areas of discourse, teaching and research, it has achieved hegemony. Of course this achievement is partial and ever-precarious in a still-male-dominated academy

¹⁰⁵ Carrigan *et al.*, in Connell, 'Special Issue Masculinities', note Ehrenreich's argument that men of the 'left', engaged in attempts to consider their practices as men, have experienced "the paralyzing politics of guilt" (1993b: 55).

¹⁰⁶ See McMahon's review of feminist theories, where he argues that a tendency to psychologise sexual politics in feminist work ignores the power of the few historical and cultural accounts of masculinity (McMahon 1993). He writes, "Instead of wondering whether they should change their behaviour, men wrestle with the meaning of masculinity. Domination is an aspect of masculinity rather than something men simply do. Even practice-based analyses of masculinity find it hard to avoid construing masculinity as some kind of thing-in-itself. McMahon (in 'Special Issue: Masculinities' *Theory and Society*, 1993b (22) (5): 690-691) cited by Hearn (1996: 207). McMahon's point is made in reference to Brittan (1989) who locates his work in men's lived experiences.

and society; yet the intellectual and political influence of feminism in these spheres has been prodigious (McLennan 1995: 391).

Hearn shares the concern of feminist sociologists, arguing that a research focus on men through the concept of 'masculinity' "... might be developed to divert attention away from women rendering them invisible and excluding them as participants in discourse" (Hearn 1996: 203). Hearn argues for an analysis of gender that retains men in relation to women, and in relation to other men. Above all, 'masculinities' have emerged as no longer individual possessions, but as institutional practices located in structures of power (Hearn 1996: 206). Connell notes how language tends to reify, in written accounts of 'gender', what is experienced as *trajectory* in social experience (Strauss 1993). Connell argues that 'gender' is social practice *within* sociality, an *aspect* of social processes. The extent to which 'gender' is compelling is influenced by other aspects of social experience current in a specific social context (Connell 1987: 140).

Gender and schools

Research has shown schools to have an active, though not always explicitly articulated politics of gender, for example, theories of 'sex-role' had a positive impact on educational research and policy in relation to girls (Connell 1987). Connell writes that,

...girls would be advantaged by modifying ... their restrictive 'sex role'... or even breaking out of it ... this lead easily to an educational strategy: a programme of compensation and redress to expand girls occupational and intellectual horizons, affirm women's worth, write women into the curriculum, and so on... By implication the boys were getting one too... A puzzled literature on the 'male sex role' in the 1970s (documented by Carrigan, Connell and Lee, 1985) scratched pretty hard to find ways by which men are dis-advantaged or damaged by their sex role. No convincing educational program ever came of it (Connell 1993: 91).

Connell prophetically noted, "Teachers grappling with issues of masculinity for boys now seem to be reaching for concepts beyond 'role', and expecting to face a politicized and emotionally-charged situation" (Connell 1993: 91).

Connell and others found evidence of practices, or 'gender regimes' among students and staff, for example sport, dancing and discipline, which he argues construct different kinds of 'masculinities' and 'femininities', through four 'kinds of

relationships' (Connell 1996).¹⁰⁷ Usually, a distinct sexual division of labour was evident among staff, and among students, sex differences were evident in leisure activities and tastes. Connell argues that 'gender order' among students can be 'hegemonic' or 'subordinate', and can vary in degree of importance relative to other concerns. Gendered conflicts are evident in schools among teachers over sexism in the curriculum and with respect to promotion, and among students conflicts existed around issues of leadership and social prestige (Connell 1985).

Connell argues that "Schools have often been seen as masculinity-making devices" (Connell 1993), and his use of a life history approach, explores men's schooling experiences, and analyses their accounts through 'masculinity'. From a social psychological approach, Connell argues that *within* a school different forms of 'masculinity' are being produced. Connell writes,

A violent discipline system invites competition in machismo. More generally, the authority structure of the school becomes the antagonist against which one's masculinity is cut (Connell 1993: 94).

Connell argues that in reference to the social world *beyond* school "... masculinity is organized - on the macro scale - around social power " (1993: 95). Mac an Ghaill draws on Connell, to argue that examinations of 'under achievement of boys' relative to girls through 'masculinities', must be able to take account of the constraints of 'hardening class inequality' (Ghaill 1996). In a range of different kinds of schools, in the UK and Australia, for example in the work of Hargreaves, 1967; Willis, 1977; Walker 1988; Kessler *et al* , 1985; Connell notes research into processes 'demarcating masculinities', for example, 'cool guys', 'wimps' and 'swots' (Connell 1993: 95). Connell's Stewart Hardy begins as a 'wimp' becomes a 'lad' and under pressure from his working class parents, emerges as having adopted a 'masculinity' of "... rationality and responsibility rather than pride and aggressiveness" (Connell 1993: 97). The extent to which schools (if by that we mean as a formal objective) produce 'masculinities' is challenged by Willis's 'lads' (Willis 1977). In *Learning to Labour*, school authority served as a foil against which the 'lads' constructed an oppositional masculine identity (Connell 1995: 37). Willis did not explain why *all*

¹⁰⁷ See Connell (1996: 213 -214), where he draws upon the concepts of power, division of labour, patterns of emotion and symbolisation, to present his argument that schools be defined as 'agents in the making of masculinities'.

boys from similar backgrounds were not able to, and/or wished to choose to be one of the 'lads' or indeed one of the 'earoles' (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990: 141-176).

Connell argues that social organisation of practices at school reflect current ideologies regarding sexual conduct within a specific institution to produce different forms of 'masculinities' and 'femininities'; he qualifies this generalisation of gender variations across schools to note one consistent similarity across schools, "No school ... permits open homosexual relationships" (Connell 1987: 120).¹⁰⁸ Adapting Connell's notion of 'cool guys', Martino's Foucauldian analysis refers to negotiation of "normalising practices in which sexuality is deployed as a specific category for defining acceptable masculinity" (Martino 1999: 256). Martino and Mac an Ghaill, argue 'masculinities' and 'sexualities' contribute towards complex power relations (Mac an Ghaill 1996: 2- 4).¹⁰⁹ Mac an Ghaill's analysis of teacher-pupil relations highlights boys' negotiations of an acceptable masculinity at school (Ghaill 1988) , for example, 'high achieving /conformist/Asian', vis a vis, 'low achieving/truculent/Afro-Caribbean', to reflect normative links between institutional and social characteristics of an acceptable male pupil in Kilby School. Negotiation of an acceptable male/pupil 'identity' emerges as more of a problem among poor and minority ethnic boys. Kilby School is described as structurally a 'white school'. Schools are **not** structured by 'colour', which is a noun, but Connell is closer to 'negotiated order' as 'authority' refers to a decision making among social actors. Schools are social institutions structured by rules and social norms, the meanings of which are necessarily negotiated in everyday interaction (Woods 1990b).¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ See Mac an Ghaill (1994: 177 -178) who cites Chitty (1994: 15 - 18) 'Sex, lies and indoctrination', *Forum* 36 (1), for his critique of an amendment to The Sex Education Act (1993) as reflected in DfE Circular 11/87 Section 19, which no longer allows for the recognition of sexual difference in schools, to argue this legislative change represent a reassertion of heterosexuality and family values in schools. Mac an Ghaill cites Rattansi's (1992: 2) presentation of the argument that schools reproduce existing inequalities as reflected in society's social/cultural stratification.

¹⁰⁹ See A. Tolson (1977) *The Limits of Masculinity*. London: Tavistock; R.W. Connell (1987) *Gender and Power*; L. Segal (1990) *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*. London: Virago.

¹¹⁰ Woods (1990b: 3) illustrates this process with a description of his experience of 'breaching' school rules, for example, he received the cane, which the law allowed at the

Among socially differentiated pupil and teacher populations, 'masculinity' and 'femininity' emerge as concepts that embody actors' normative rules of everyday gendered interaction. This insight was useful in analysis of pupils' and teachers' accounts of Exclusion, which the thesis argues is an outcome of negotiation of 'gender relations' at school.

Summary

This chapter has drawn upon Durkheim's notion of 'deviance' as a normal aspect of everyday interactions that constitute 'social order' within 'society', to examine its implications for 'society' as characterised by 'individualism' or 'moral individualism'. The chapter has outlined social theory's shift from functionalist understandings of the 'individual', where social norms are assumed to be 'taken for granted' as shared. This chapter has examined interactionism, which has helped make a theoretical turn from 'individual subject' towards a 'sociological subject', and provided theoretical resources to account for 'intersubjectivity'. Social explanation requires to go beyond identifying 'intersubjectivity' in order to create a reflexive account of social action (Gouldner, 1970; Garfinkel, 1967a: 1; See also Heritage, 1984: particularly pages 101-109).

The chapter has examined social relations as rule governed, to argue rules and social norms act as normative referents for judging action. Heritage paraphrases Garfinkel to write, "The norm is ... *doubly constitutive* of the circumstances it organizes ... the availability of the norm will provide a means by which the conduct and its circumstances can be rendered sensible, describable and accountable" (1984: 108- 109). Social actors are shown as necessary participants in everyday negotiation of meanings of rules and social norms; a rule emerges as reflecting the regularity of socially accepted practice; definition of what constitutes socially acceptable practice is precisely what actors negotiate. At a micro-social level, creating and/or maintaining a social 'identity', as an outcome of interaction, is evidently experienced as a continual relational struggle for social recognition.

Connell argues social relations are gendered relations (Connell 1987). This chapter has examined everyday essentialist understandings of 'masculinity' and 'femininity', to show how these understandings act as normative rules that govern how people,

time, after three 'breaches' of the school rules. Woods had been at school for three years before he learned what 'breaches' meant.

men as 'masculine' and women as 'feminine', 'ought to' act and interact. Understood in this way categories of gender, 'masculinity' and 'femininity', effectively suppress attempts to explain problems of gendered experience in terms of a post-positivist 'dialogue', free of essentialist constraints. New categories for men's actual experiences, 'masculinities' are useful for organising and presenting differential experiences among men, but these categories do not transcend essentialism associated with 'masculinity'. Whilst social differentiation is built into 'masculinities' and 'femininities', the slippage between concept and everyday common-sense knowledge remains problematic.

At school, formal rules are expected to govern formal relations, but data show a tension between formal rule following and rule making and informal rule following and rule making. The former constitutes the 'institutional order' of education, whilst the latter constitutes the 'social' order of everyday gendered relationships. Pupils' compulsory attempts to participate in everyday social relations at school require social acceptance as a person within a 'social order' of pupils, and as a learner within the 'institutional order' of a school. When pupils are 'in trouble' at school, moral, theoretical and practical referents are drawn upon in resolving problems that are expressed primarily as an individual's problem. The price of extending democracy by the state among its mass population was children's loss of liberty. Education nevertheless is legally and morally expected to make provision for children according to 'learning needs' and in accordance with their parents wishes. Education in practice is necessarily an outcome of negotiation of material and relational resources. As an outcome of participation within 'school relations', youngsters in this research express their hope for social recognition and acceptance; as a male or female person and as a pupil.

Chapter Three

Social inquiry and education

problems of sociological accounts

Introduction

Chapter Three describes the process of social inquiry, data production and analysis that largely constitutes this thesis. In late modernity, political and cultural shifts in the treatment of children in research, argue for children's rights and obligations on the basis of children's capacity to act competently as participants (James and Prout 1990). This chapter draws upon general methodological accounts of problems raised by sociological approaches to social inquiry in the public domain, particularly noting links between 'ethical practice' as 'informed consent' (Barnes 1979). Research with children and young people bring the problems of 'ethical practice' and 'informed consent' sharply into focus due to social and emotional immaturity associated with youth, and a potential for abuse of young research participants due to differences in social power in adult/child relationships (Alderson 1995). The chapter conceptualises social inquiry as a discursive process, and examines implications of rejecting 'behaviourist' approaches to research in education with respect to research design, categories and choice of methods. The chapter outlines problems associated with creating categories adequate to examining the phenomenon of gendered processes of inclusion/exclusion at school. Cognisant of the necessarily reflexive character of accounting, data is presented to illustrate some methodological problems that ultimately shape the status of any epistemological claims the thesis makes in relation to this research into social processes leading to gendered Exclusion (Gitlin 1993).

Agency of young people

Modernity has given rise to a long process of democratisation of relations within Western liberal society, a process involving struggles for recognition and acceptance. Raymond Williams described democracy as a "long revolution" (1961;1965; 1975). Following Williams, Juliet Mitchell named women's relatively late access to democracy as the "longest revolution", which called attention to the gender blind character of democracy (1984). O'Neil challenged the character of public

discourses relating to children and young people in liberal states in modernity arguing that the child is 'missing' (O'Neil 1994). Although not ratified in the UK until 1992, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), suggests a final unfolding of democracy in its explicit recognition of children and young people as having rights, summarised as participation, protection and privacy. In relation to Exclusion the impact of the Convention "...does not create rights and duties in domestic law but the United Kingdom is obliged under international law to ensure that it is respected" (SOEID 1997: 16). The salience of discussions that draw upon a 'rights discourse', which relates to public *and* private institutions, rests upon a perception of the weakening of traditional family forms, especially among those who work with children 'in trouble'.¹¹¹ Brannen and O'Brien write,

Essential to our understanding of modern childhood, particularly in the UK, is the diminution in parental, particularly paternal, rights over children and growth in the importance of parental duties, obligations and responsibilities towards children. It is clear that absolute paternal authority is no longer the main organizer of generational and gender relations in domestic and institutional life. However, discourses of children's vulnerability and need for protection continue to co-exist, sometimes uneasily, with discourses of children's right to empowerment and self determination (1996: 3).

Social inquiry until relatively recently has located children and young people within the family, subsumed within the category of woman. Brannen and O'Brien, drawing upon Beck (1992) Giddens (1991) and Zelitzer (1985), argue the 'child and 'young person' in Western society have become 'economically useless'¹¹² and 'emotionally priceless' (Brannen and O'Brien 1996). In conditions of increasing individualisation of 'public problems' as 'private issues' many families are unable to fend for themselves. Norvick's foreword to O'Neil states,

¹¹¹ See for example the Annual Review (1996/1997) of the National Children's Bureau which styles itself as the 'powerful voice for the child'. In a statement of its values and principles the National Children's Bureau writes, "In celebrating ... the richness and diversity of childhood ... we are committed to hearing and responding to the views of children". The organisation has close links with its counterparts Children in Scotland and Children in Wales, organisations that work 'for children and their families'.

¹¹² The 'economic uselessness' of children is an intended outcome of a liberal state's approach to children's social welfare.

Liberal concepts of the individual as the primary unit of social experience place children in precarious states of vulnerability and risk in their daily lives (O'Neil 1994: x).

Legislative change from the Children Act 1948 to the Children Act 1995, reflects cultural shifts in the UK in attempts to improve public services for children. The principle is now accepted that children and young people ought to be able to expect, to have access to relevant provision, to participate and have due protection in public processes (Packman 1993). Neo-liberalism in the late twentieth century prioritises the market as a driving force in society and as indicated in Chapter One, education is no exception.

Following Hardman (1973), who noted an absence of children's accounts of their lives, sociological study of children and childhood has undergone change in recent years (Alanen 1992; Qvortrup 1994). James and Prout note contrasting positions between sociologists who like themselves have engaged in "... wresting the study of childhood from out of the familial context of socialisation within which for so many years, it was traditionally located" (James and Prout 1996: 41).¹¹³ Family sociologists, for example, Brannen and O'Brien, call for changes in sociological accounts of children and youth through " ... refocusing on *children in families* rather than *families with children* (their italics)" (Brannen and O'Brien 1996: 2). Jenks's argument, paraphrased by Brannen and O'Brien, is that a " ... decline in commitment and trust previously generated through stable marriage and parental partnership has changed the nature of adults' relationship to children" ((Jenks 1996: 3). Drawing upon the critical legal perspective of Roche (1996) Brannen and O'Brien describe changes in communities, where "... difference and heterogeneity in contemporary culture make consensus over children's rights difficult to achieve" (Brannen and O'Brien 1996: 4). In redefining boundaries between children and their connection within communities, "... both are linked by the idea of a 'public conversation'" (Roche 1996: 26).

When the state seeks to intervene in the private lives of children and young people, an added complexity emerges from John Stuart Mill's classic formulation of the

¹¹³ See the work of Qvortrup (1994) 'Childhood Matters: An Introduction' in J Qvortrup, M Bardy, G Sgritta and H Wintersberger (eds.) *Childhood Matters: Social Theory, Practice and Politics*, Aldershot: Avebury, and Alanen L. (1992) *Modern Childhood? Exploring the Child Question in Sociology*, Jyvaskyla, University of Jyvaskyla.

tension at the heart of liberalism. Within a public right to know and an adult person's right to privacy, as mentioned above, a child has a right to provision, participation and protection, which includes a right to his/her privacy. Political relationships between the subject/citizen and state emerges as a set of relationships, multi-themed and hierarchically differentiated, between potential speakers, arguably the child, its parents or carers and the state. The problem of reconciling conflicting interests, whether it be the child v its parents (Roche 1996)¹¹⁴ or the 'disruptive' pupil v the rest of the class (Mitchell 1996: 120), creates concrete relational and material problems.¹¹⁵ Associated with problems of contradictions within dis/agreement is the question of social competence, that is, can young peoples' views be relied upon?

An issue of social competency

Current research with children and young people is shaped by a central debate about 'social competency' (Alanen 1995). As a prerequisite of social competency, a 'modern child' is argued to have a capacity to give a 'rational' consideration of events. Brannen and O'Brien draw upon James and Prout's "... modern child (who) is a 'strategic actor' using varying modes of action dependent on the nature of the context and as such is neither passively socialized nor thought to possess a unitary identity" (Brannen and O'Brien 1996: 4). James and Prout, critical of research approaches to children and young people that draw upon functionalist theories of young people, argue young people's *capacity* for agency has never been in doubt (1990; 1995). Academic and professional accounts of children's social action, reflect a

¹¹⁴See Gerison Lansdown (1995) *Taking Part: Children's Participation in Decision Making* London: Institute for Public Policy Research, for a good discussion of the practical problems faced by policy makers in their attempts to draft and implement policies that promote the rights of the child in the United Kingdom, which, a) balance the rights of children in the context of their parents rights, and b) allow children to participate in decision making processes that significantly shape their everyday lives (Lansdown 1995). For example in cases of divorce and child abuse. See also Priscilla Alderson's work with Barnardos, reported in *Listening to Children: Children, ethics and social research* (1995). Alderson draws upon research with children which examines their rights to participation in consenting to surgical operations.

¹¹⁵ See draft Circular No /97 Section 7 and inherent social tension created by the principles of 'best interests of the child' and 'the risk to good order', that inform decision making regarding the Exclusion of a pupil (SOEID 1997).

continued tension between functionalist *and* interactionist understandings of children and young people as competent social actors.

Connolly, for example, in his approaches to researching racism among the young, attempts to rethink methods of researching with children (Connolly 1997). Connolly argues that many professionals and academics continue to be influenced by Piaget and developmental perspectives on socialisation of children. Connolly's participants are age 5-6 years and therefore come within Piaget's concept of 'pre-operational stage' which means,

As such they are assumed to be egocentric, unable to attend to more than one idea at a time and lacking the ability to think beyond their immediate experience to form more abstract concepts (Connolly 1997: 162).

Connolly argues that a functionalist conceptualisation of socialisation and developmental models of childhood, "... neglect the agency and social competence of children"¹¹⁶ to criticise essentialist research perspectives on children that "... tend to deny the contingency and context specific nature of racialised identities" (Working paper 1995: 1). Connolly specifically rejects psychological and sociometric testing as inadequate methods for researching with children. He argues such methods construct children as research 'objects'. Connolly's statement, "I am primarily interested in causality" suggests his work is not entirely free of functionalism, as 'causality' is strongly associated with the very positivistic methods that Connolly is arguing against (Connolly 1997: 176).

Public debates about Exclusion illustrate how children and young people's views of themselves as actors in the social world are questioned on the basis of whether they are considered to be trustworthy. More specifically, young people's views have been rejected on the grounds of a perception that young people cannot act rationally. In England and Wales, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools, Chris Woodhead, for example in a television interview recorded in 1998 to discuss the Exclusion of a teenage girl from mainstream school, stated pupils at age 15 are not "... capable of

¹¹⁶ Working Paper. 'Seen but never heard: rethinking approaches to researching racism and young children', presented at *Children and Social Competence: An interdisciplinary Conference*, held at the University of Surrey, 5-7 July 1995.

rational thought".¹¹⁷ Woodhead's views on children and young people's capacity to act rationally are rejected by this thesis, as following Alanen, "I take for granted that children are competent social actors" (Alanen 1995). The thesis acknowledges that conducting social inquiry with young people raises short term and long term issues regarding their safety.

Loss of innocence

Social science's traditional view of young children as 'innocent' objects of research, is challenged by those seeking to redefine children in the light of social theory which gives children the status of 'communicative actors' (Habermas 1987: 113 190).¹¹⁸ If children are argued to be competent social actors capable of agency, children and young people lose the dubious protection of the 'innocence' traditionally associated with a relative moral and emotional 'immaturity'. Arguments for 'hearing children and young people', consistent with an interactionist perspective, have a potential for creating negative effects on children and young people. At what age and to what degree **should** children and young people's 'voices be heard', and what kinds of impact will their agency have upon their own and other youngsters' lives? Situations exist where children do wrong things; if children are deemed to be capable of agency in the sense that James and Prout (1996) argue, what implications does that raise for support and/or punishment?

In Parson's 'normative order' and relatively stable families, the idea of children as 'innocent' arguably afforded a degree of protection. In the context of a society as 'negotiated order' (Strauss 1964; 1993), children are argued to be able to speak for themselves. Shifts in boundaries between 'private' and 'public' worlds raise the issue of protection for children, which frequently falls to a range of professionals to act as advocates. Barnes notes the problem of conflicting interests, which in the case of children, for better or for worse, shape youngsters experiences of negotiating

¹¹⁷ Chris Woodhead's statement reflects a Parsonian view of actor's capacity to 'know' their own world. See Heritage, J. (1984: 24-36). For Parsons rationality is defined as knowledge produced by the scientist, whose method is argued to rational due to the conditions in which it is produced (as knowledge produced within a community of knowledge producers who through a process of peer review are argued to be able to keep individual error under control) and, more rational than the knowledge of lay actors.

¹¹⁸ Later chapters take up the implications of Habermas' theory of 'communicative action' in relation to pupils own categories of 'communicative action'.

'trouble' in the public domain (Barnes 1979). Acceptance of the argument that children and young people are socially competent to participate in social inquiry, heightens a researchers' attention to ethical considerations, in the context of general problems of addressing the relationship between methodology and epistemology in social inquiry.

Methodological Tensions: on social inquiry into education

This research did not proceed smoothly due to use of education system categories, which contradicted an adoption of social constructionism as a broad theoretical approach. An initial use of Scottish Office education categories used as a way of locating pupils, created practical and analytical difficulties.¹¹⁹ Methodological literature that shaped my understandings of the relationship between a research problem, data production, its analysis and statements of findings about the research problem, did not clarify what a colleague described as a problem of 'methodological tension'. No idea is truly understood until it is written down (Spradley 1980). Resolution of those difficulties came through writing, which sharpened my theoretical understandings of the implications of rejecting positivist quests for 'objective' statements of 'knowledge' about the social world.

Sociological literature reflected its methodological and epistemological confusions, for example, in debates between feminist social scientists who argued for a specific feminist methodology, a point sharply contested by Hammersley.¹²⁰ Claims to a 'feminist methodology' as a way of addressing 'power relations' within social inquiry appeared to be confused with questions of the relative status of research claims made on the basis of 'qualitative' or 'quantitative' research methodologies. Substantively, feminist researchers have worked to overcome the traditional invisibility of women in social research (Eichler 1988) Disagreement turned upon social sciences' use of categories attributed with essentialist status, which feminists showed were not adequate to including gender difference. Sociology debated the

¹¹⁹ Chapter One shows how official knowledge of Exclusion is constrained within the positivism of its official categories.

¹²⁰ See the debate between Hammersley, Ramazanoglu and Gelsthorpe in *Sociology*, (1992) vol. 26: 187 -206; 207 -212; 213 -218, in which sociologists thrashed out epistemological and methodological confusion in relation to epistemological questions raised by feminist research into women's social experiences.

explanatory adequacy of 'patriarchy' as a statement of male power in relation to gender inequalities; 'gender relations' emerged as a more robust intellectual category for addressing gender differences in actors' negotiation of social experience (Connell 1985b; Finch 1993; Morgan 1986).¹²¹

A recognition of the value of qualitative approaches with regard to establishing actors' meanings led to research designs that included a mix of methodologies. David Reynolds recalls David Hargreaves' use of qualitative and quantitative methods in his study carried out in secondary schools (Hargreaves 1967; Reynolds 1991). The aim in such projects was to use quantitative data to generate hypotheses and use qualitative methods to explore findings in schools and the social processes that "... lay behind statistical relationships". Accounts of educational research indicate that theoretical approaches to social inquiry, from circa 1970, have fallen roughly into a quantitative/qualitative divide. Reynolds reports "... sociology of education and sociology in general were divided into two oppositional camps, which utilized naturalistic *or* positivistic methods (his italics)" (Reynolds 1991: 194). A persistence of 'positivism' in approaches to understanding Exclusion is evident in Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools (HMI) research into 16 LEA's in England and Wales (HMI/Ofsted 1995/6). The HMI analysed statistical data "... to determine what correlation, if any there was between the rate of permanent and fixed-term exclusion and: a) the proportion of pupils on free school meals (FSM), and b) the overall quality of the school." (HMI/Ofsted 1995/6: 4). Analysis showed a statistical *association* between categories, but was unable to explain meanings behind the association.

Accusations of bias raised against survey research methods illustrate the importance of having categories *within* a method of data collection with sufficient range and scope upon which to base a general claim. In education, for example Burnhill *et al*, summarise general criticisms of survey researchers working for governments as those,

¹²¹ See J. A. Cook and M. M. Fonow (1986) 'Knowledge and Women's Interests: Issues of Epistemology and Methodology in Feminist Sociological Research' *Sociological Inquiry*. vol. 56 (Winter): 2-29.

... [who] tended to take government's problems as given ... must always elicit its data in ways that abuse or incompletely represent the understandings of its 'subjects'... Overall the view was that survey research *sui generis* was pathological, and could only serve the interests of the powerful (Burnhill *et al.* 1987: 207-29).

Survey researchers' criticisms against survey research are illustrated by criticisms of Scottish School Leavers surveys (Bryant *et al.* 1985), which were not against survey research *per se*, but directed towards a failure to include views of **all** pupils in its account; surveys were criticisable because those who created categories for research inquiries did not include a category of 'non-academic' pupils. Accepting much of the force of such criticisms, Burnhill *et al.* argue that research bias might not all be down to the interests of the powerful, but as an outcome of "... the contingency of politics and history" (Burnhill *et al.* 1987). Nevertheless, in the light of these criticisms the Centre for Educational Sociology (CES) set about broadening its choice of problems and reviewed its methods of research.

Among the documents to emerge from this decision was Gray, McPherson and Raffae's empirical evaluation of the public account of education that had guided Scottish Education policy and practice in the thirty years after 1945 (Gray *et al.* 1983).¹²² Gray *et al.* showed that 'non-academic' pupils had been excluded from an optimistic public account of education in Scotland. McPherson's qualitative interviews with retired SED officials were central to a critical evaluation of Scottish education (McPherson 1983: 216 -244). As changes to the curriculum in Scotland were brought about through listening to children who had traditionally not been included in academic terms, it could be argued that in Scottish education children and young people have entered public debate (Gow and McPherson 1980). Certainly with regard to the 'public conversation' about Exclusion, in Scotland the breadth of participants in the *Exclusions From School and Alternatives* project is impressive (Cullen *et al.* 1996a; 1996b; 1996c).

Barnes defines social research as "... systematic inquiry into the ways in which people, and the social institutions they create and operate, behave in relation to one another and to their environment" (Barnes 1979: 13). Barnes argues social research, set up to explain the failure of Enlightenment ideals, highlights questions of power

¹²² See Chapter One for a brief discussion of the 'myth of egalitarianism' in Scottish education.

and normative views among those who carry out research, as key determinants of social inquiry (Barnes 1979). Barnes writes,

I concentrate on the ethical problems that arise in connection with social inquiry. These cannot be isolated from the politics of social research and I discuss the distribution of power in the conduct of research in connection with ethical issues, rather than in its own right.' (Barnes 1979: 9).

Thus, ethical, methodological and empirical questions are mutually constitutive. Barnes describes four kinds of actors in social inquiry, differentiated in terms of their power to control research processes. Barnes discusses references to 'subjects' or 'objects' in social inquiry, terms that he criticises as reflections of positivist natural science. Barnes offers the term 'citizens', I have used the term 'participants'. Barnes writes,

...social inquiry may ... be seen as a process of interaction and negotiation between scientist, sponsor, gatekeeper and citizen" (Barnes 1979: 15).

Barnes argues that all four kinds of actors have distinctive interests, normative perspectives on the world, and views as to the purpose of research, "the ends which we hold to be good or bad in themselves..." (Barnes 1979: 16). Barnes argues,

... initially empirical inquiries in social science conformed to a natural science paradigm in which citizens and scientists were not only socially but also analytically and epistemologically unequal (Barnes 1979: 23).

Barnes notes Homans's methodological positivism,

People who write about methodology often forget that it is a matter of strategy, not of morals (Homans 1949: 330 cited in Barnes 1979: 31).¹²³

Discussions in the literature around authors' justifications for use of covert observation illustrate these tensions, for example, Burgess outlines Erikson's attack on covert methods (Burgess 1987: 197-200). Defending social research from charges of bias emerges as central to its credibility (Burgess 1984: 143 -165).

Authors 'came to the rescue'; for example, Denzin's roots lie with C Wright Mill's sociological imagination, which consists in the "... biographical, interactional and

¹²³ See G. Homans (1949) 'The strategy of industrial sociology', *American Journal of Sociology*, 54: 330-337. Homans, engaged in methodological problems associated with researching in the area of industrial sociology, succinctly illustrates the difference between a natural science approach and a sociological approach to social science.

historical”(Denzin and Lincoln 1994: 272 - 277;Denzin 1989). Denzin elaborates Mill's meaning to define *interpretive interactionism*, a phrase signifying attempts to link a *symbolic interactionist* approach with the *interpretive, phenomenological* works of Heidegger and hermeneutics. Interpretive interactionism draws upon recent work in feminist social theory, postmodern theory and the critical-biographical method formulated by C. Wright Mills, Sartre and Merleau-Ponty. Denzin cites Mills (1959); Baudrillard (1983); and Lyotard (1984) as contributors towards interpretive interactionism which aims to build studies that make sense of the postmodern period of human experience (Denzin 1989: 14).¹²⁴ However, drawing upon Hawkesworth,¹²⁵ Holmwood writes, "... it might seem the ultimate 'bad faith' that postmodern theory denies the possibility of an inclusive social theory or political practice just at the point that feminists have identified the specific ways in which women have been excluded from the structures of modern citizenship despite formal statements of their inclusion" (Holmwood 1996: 24). This research does not draw directly upon postmodern theory as its arguments do not offer much hope for creating new theoretical resources for Excluded pupils.

Quantitative approaches, characterised as positivist, have sometimes appeared to be winning out against qualitative approaches. Policy makers and funders in the field of educational research, for example, are arguably powerful players, as evidenced by the perspective and tone of argument in calls for codes of practice to clarify issues of ownership in educational research (Barnes 1979; Elliot 1989; Wilkinson and Brown 1991).¹²⁶ Quantitative approaches are defended in terms of a *belief* in their potential as generators of reliable and generalisable knowledge. Knowledge presented in a quantitative form is more readily disseminated to people in a 'hurry' to grasp the relevant 'facts', but such a view suggests a failure of understanding amongst users of 'facts' generated in this way, with respect to the kinds of claims that can be made on the basis of quantitative research.

¹²⁴ See J. Baudrillard (1983) *Simulations* New York: Semiotext(e), Inc. J Lyotard (1984) *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

¹²⁵ See M. E. Hawkesworth, (1989) 'Knower, knowing, known', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 14 (3): 557. Nancy C. M. Hartsock (1988) made an earlier statement of this point.

¹²⁶ See Appendix 111 for a discussion of codes of practice drawn up for social research generally and more particularly educational research.

Social theory raised critical questions, for example, Garfinkel challenged 'taken for granted' assumptions of everyday life to reveal everyday rules of interaction (1967).¹²⁷ Gouldner argued that social inquiry necessarily produces a reflexive account, which must take account of 'lay actors' own definitions of their situation (Gouldner 1970). Habermas draws upon a Meadian tradition, to argue interaction is the basic unit of social inquiry, but that sociological knowledge must go beyond actor's own definitions of their situation (Pusey 1988). Social theory addresses these issues as three interconnected problems; of rationality, intersubjectivity and reflexivity.¹²⁸ In educational research, Walford outlines the influence of reflexivity in challenging the idea that social and educational research should design research and present its findings as 'scientific' and 'objective', and without any reference to the researcher (Walford 1991: 1-18). The 'myth of objectivity' and the appropriateness of positivism in methodology and methods in relation to social inquiry is dispatched (Medawar 1963).¹²⁹ With 'scientific certainty' punctured, how did one proceed with social inquiry?

In a post-positivist research climate, adjudication of reliability and validity of social research findings focuses on a demonstrable linking of a research problem to its research design, questions and choice of methods. As the discussion above shows, the breadth and scope of categories of analysis are crucial as the basis upon which researchers may make interpretive claims about the research. Within these specifications, I tried to strike a balance between ethics and practice in my attempts to create an account that draws upon a logical and coherent analysis of research, which acknowledges differential power in research relations.

Gender in research designs

An important aspect of the research design was developed as a critical response to Paul Willis's narrow focus upon boys whose 'identities' were shaped in the context

¹²⁷ See Garfinkel, H. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

¹²⁸ For a good discussion of the problems of rationality, intersubjectivity and reflexivity see Heritage, 1984: 24- 36.

¹²⁹ See Peter Medawar (1963) 'Is the scientific paper a fraud?' Listener, 12 September, cited in Walford 1991: 1-18.

of mixed schooling (Willis 1977).¹³⁰ A gender bias is similarly reflected in feminist attempts to rectify the imbalance between accounts which emphasise boys cultural experience whilst traditionally ignoring girls' cultural experiences (Griffiths 1995). Authors largely write descriptions of girls' and boys' social relations in ways that represent gender as a dichotomy, emphasising male and female differences as stereotypes argued to be ideal types (Hey 1997; Lees 1993; Tinkler 1995; Sharpe 1994: 63). Thorne reports that studies of gender and children's social relations have mostly followed a two worlds model that relied upon the concept of 'subculture' (Lever 1976; Maltz and Borker 1983). Thorne writes,

Sex segregation is so common in elementary schools that it is meaningful to speak of separate girls' and boys' worlds (Thorne 1993: 115).

Drawing upon research into 'middle childhood', Thorne characterises boys as tending to interact in larger age-heterogeneous groups that engage in rough and tumble play, where organised sports is a major metaphor for boys' play and boys' 'subcultures'. The language of teams constructs interaction in the form of a contest. Thorne argues boys evidently communicate through more frequent use of direct commands, insults, and challenges, which contributes to social groupings characterised as shifting hierarchies. Thorne notes girls' social relations are conducted in private or small spaces and are therefore less public than boys, for example on a football pitch. Girls' groups are smaller or even in pairs, where play is more co-operative and turn-taking. Girls, it is argued, have more intense and exclusive friendships, which take shape around keeping and telling secrets, shifting alliances, and indirect ways of expressing disagreement. "Instead of" the way boys do it, i.e., by directly commanding each other, girls say 'let's' or 'we gotta'. Thorne writes,

¹³⁰ Willis did not include minority ethnic pupils in his study, and whilst aware of disproportionate numbers of minority ethnic boys who currently experience Exclusion relative to 'white' boys, the gendered focus of this research prevailed. Time and space have prevented me from addressing the relationship between minority ethnicity and Exclusion. Despite this decision the selection process at City School notably produced minority ethnic girls. For reasons of emotional vulnerability they were not invited to participate, nevertheless, two more minority ethnic girls ultimately emerged from the selection process and eventually participated in the study. This fact raises questions about minority ethnic pupils experience in Scottish secondary schools and a problem of maintaining participant's anonymity was and is brought sharply into focus when studies are small scale, which illustrates well recognised methodological and epistemological tensions of *micro vis a vis* macro approaches to social inquiry.

Although much can be learned by comparing the social organisation and subcultures of boys' and girls' groups, the separate worlds approach has eclipsed full, contextual understanding of gender and social relations among children (Thorne 1993 : 116).

Thorne refers to the few studies of girls' social relations that span 1976 to 1983, showing straightforward descriptions of characteristics attributed to girls as problematic. Researchers have had difficulty seeing and analysing girls' social relations because,

... categories for description and analysis have come more from male than female experience (Thorne, 1993 : 115).

Thorne argues a separate worlds model loses or fails to pick up individual variation that exists, for example, "...not all boys fight, and some have intense and exclusive friendships" (Thorne 1993: 116). Thorne's work illustrates the problem of expressing difference without implying a value, or drawing upon 'masculinity' and 'femininity' as stereotypes to organise descriptions of male or female relations. Embedded in Thorne's account is a notion of 'norm', and the 'norm' appears to be the 'way boys do it' (Thorne 1993; Griffiths 1986: 95).

State schools and schooling are largely a mixed sex experience and it seemed logical to research boys and girls in *one coherent study*, rather than to continue to make gender comparisons *across studies* constructed within different conditions and 'school relations'. The research gave gender a central focus, through having equal numbers of girls and boys across all substantive categories of inquiry.

Selection of pupils through the concept of sebd

Research in Town School, initially designated as a 'pilot study' for the 'main study' ahead, was conducted for a number of reasons.¹³¹ First, to explore the usefulness of the label sebd as a way into discussing in/discipline at school. Second, to establish a set of categories broad enough to ensure selection procedures that would include pupils with different experiences of in/discipline at school.¹³² After selection of pupils, a third point was to gain some insight into pupils' everyday talk about three

¹³¹ See Appendix 1V for for 'Questions for teachers in Pilot Study (later called Town School) to 'find' pupils with 'sebd'".

¹³² See Appendix V for the selection process used in both schools.

main research concerns; 'masculinity' and 'femininity'; 'behavioural difficulties'; and how people at school become known as 'bad'. A focus group discussion provided a collective point of reference for participants and me, and was chosen as a way of exploring research themes at a collective level.¹³³ Finally, analysis of Town School's focus group interview was to serve as a basis for constructing an interview guide that drew on pupils everyday ways of talking about in/discipline at school and meanings they attached to their concepts.¹³⁴

In selecting pupils as research participants my initial aim was to fit the following categories: a) equal numbers of boys and girls who were b) thought to have sebd, c) who were in S3 year, and finally d) I expected to match pupils by level of educational attainment using Standard Grade categories of foundation /credit and general. In summary, pupils were to be selected from within the following categories; sex, sebd, located at S3 and by academic attainment.¹³⁵ During the process of checking out the feasibility of the proposed selection procedure, the meanings of and relationship between the categories of sebd and Exclusion emerged as characteristically ambiguous.¹³⁶

Participants and their Schools

A formal letter to the Director of Education outlining the research problem , its questions and a brief description of the research design received official permission to carry out the research. Access to Town School was given after an explanatory interview with the head teacher.¹³⁷ Pupils who formally participated in this research, were all S3 pupils preparing for Standard Grade examinations, at two Scottish secondary schools, renamed Town School and City School. Pupil participants, included twenty-two 14- 15 year old youngsters, eleven boys and eleven girls.

¹³³ See AppendixV1 for focus group guide used in both schools.

¹³⁴ See Appendix V11 for pupil interview guide used in both schools

¹³⁵ Early empirical findings led to changes in the analytic categories used to select pupils, which I discuss later in the Chapter.

¹³⁶ An account of the meanings of and relationship between sebd and Exclusion is fully discussed in Chapter One.

¹³⁷ As an issue of confidentiality it would not be appropriate to offer more details.

Town School is a Catholic state secondary school located outside a major city in Scotland, which has a wide catchment area. Its pupils are largely working-class, although a significant number of pupils are from middle-class backgrounds. A minority of pupils are from other Christian religious backgrounds.

City School is a non-denominational state secondary school, centrally located in a major Scottish city. City School is well known as a 'good' school and particularly 'good' for girls. Its pupils are differentiated by social class, and the school is well known for its effect upon the local housing market.¹³⁸ Children at City School are evidently differentiated by a range of ethnicities, with 'indigenous' white Scots numerically constituting the largest ethnic category.¹³⁹

Teachers who formally participated in the research totalled nineteen; six at Town School, two women and four men; and five women and seven men at City School. The term 'teachers' includes two head teachers, depute heads, senior members of staff and a range of subject class teachers. Whilst teachers at City School are more broadly differentiated by ethnicity, at Town School teachers are either Scots or English, with some claims to ancestry in Ireland and Italy. Town School teachers were selected according to the role that they played in the school hierarchy and their role in the teaching provision for pupils with special needs.¹⁴⁰ City School teachers were selected according to their role in relation to guidance, discipline and more specifically as class teachers of participant pupils (Connell 1985a).

All teachers who participated in this research were asked their age, sex and details about their specific teaching experiences, for example, number of schools, part-time or full time employment, length of service and reasons for moving from one school to another. Promotion was the main reason for men changing schools, whereas for women teachers, a combination of reasons were given for moving from one school

¹³⁸ The price of houses in the catchment area for City School is relatively higher than in areas where the local state school is less popular with parents who want their children to attend a 'good' state school.

¹³⁹ Pupils from Asian backgrounds who were born and brought up in Scotland were socially differentiated by themselves and others pupils not by their place of birth, but, by the colour of their skin and their cultural backgrounds, which illustrates a problem central to social inquiry in its task of creating robust social categories.

¹⁴⁰ The reasons for different treatment of teachers in the research are discussed below.

to another, that is, because they gave birth or because they were seeking promotion.¹⁴¹ However, some teachers had spent as many as twenty years working at the school where he/she was currently employed. In total the experience of teachers who participated directly in the research process, reflects an impressive depth and breadth of experience in different kinds of schools in Scotland. Teachers had worked in special schools, private schools, and other secondary schools. Teachers taught a range of subjects; learning support, chemistry, drama, art and design, maths, English, French, PE, computing, history and so on (Connell, 1985b: 5-6), a pattern that is common in state schools.

As a matter of ethical consideration, I was concerned to limit negative attention on participants, particularly upon those who were known to be 'disruptive' at school. To this end I attempted to create some critical distance from participants' own 'troubled incidences' by describing the research to teachers and pupils in broad terms of interest in the effects of 'bad' behaviour on learning and teaching.¹⁴² In accordance with codes of practice and statements published by the British Sociological Association regarding principles of ethical practice and professional conduct for social researchers, all pupils and adult participants were offered a written statement of the research aims and objectives. Youngsters in this research did not consider themselves children, nor did I think of them *as* children. Aged 14 to 15, the pupils were considered to be young adults, a view reflected in the framing of the 'consent form' used in the selection of youngsters for participation in this research.¹⁴³ In line with the principle of treating pupils as 'participants', those *directly* participating in the research were provided with a consent form to be returned. The form included a request for a pupil's written consent, and, his/her parents written permission for their child's participation in the research.

¹⁴¹ Women teachers described periods of teaching in various kinds of temporary and part-time posts, whereas men teachers always described teaching in reference to full-time posts.

¹⁴² Two years after the empirical data collection was completed I met one of the pupils participants who had since left school. The pupil informed me that teachers explained to them precisely how I had selected pupils in terms of the three categories, 'no trouble', 'some trouble' and 'serious trouble'. Pupils who participated were thus very concerned about the negative labelling effect of being known to participate, nevertheless they had considered the research to be worth the risk, and had consented to participate.

¹⁴³ See Appendix V111 for copies of written communications with pupils.

Teachers and administrative staff at Town School were treated less carefully by me, due to the head teacher's enthusiasm; he *instructed* them to speak to me. I was concerned that teachers had been coerced and therefore had not participated in the spirit of 'informed consent'. However, descriptions of the research appeared to reassure staff and they responded positively. At City School, the head teacher announced my presence and offered his description of the research in the school newsletter. When it came time to observe in a class, I wrote to individual class teachers, with a description of the research and asked for permission to 'sit in' on a class.¹⁴⁴ This approach to teachers as professional individuals caused some debate among teachers. They argued the head teacher ought to have approached them more formally. I was 'checked out' by a senior Guidance teacher. Subsequently his co-operation proved to be invaluable. Although some teachers declined to co-operate, the numbers of teachers involved was sufficient to carry out classroom observations. Overall, people at both schools showed tremendous generosity and encouragement, which helped in facilitating the research. Access to pupils that 'fitted' the research categories would have been impossible without the interest and co-operation of teachers and administrative staff.

Type of child or type of experience

The next section describes the process in which the original research design and proposed categories underwent considerable redrafting. Although used in academic, policy and professional research literature, use of the category sebd among teachers did not lead straightforwardly to a selection of pupils. As outlined in Chapter One, the concept of 'social, emotional and behavioural difficulties' (sebd) is subsumed within the more embracing educational category of Special Education Needs (SEN). Following two relatively informal interviews, with the head teacher and the SEN teacher, senior teachers were interviewed at Town School, using the interview questions referred to above.¹⁴⁵ Teachers' responses to the systematically asked questions, showed a 'type of child' was not readily identified by this line of

¹⁴⁴ See Appendix VX for a copy of the letter.

¹⁴⁵ See in Appendix 1V.

questioning; Town School teachers did not use the label sebd.¹⁴⁶ Analysis of teacher interviews at Town School led to changes in research categories for selecting pupils.¹⁴⁷

Teachers responded to the concept of in/discipline to express concern about individual pupils in terms of the label 'behavioural difficulties'. They used this label to talk about problems they encountered in controlling pupils whose 'behaviour' disrupted lessons, or whose 'behaviour' created problems around the school and within the local community. Teachers described contrasting kinds of 'behaviour', that gave them cause for concern; 'acting out' and 'withdrawn'. Characteristically 'withdrawn' behaviour by a 'quiet child' was perceived to be somewhat ignored relative to 'acting out' by a 'disruptive' child. Although this was recognised as unacceptable it was considered an understandable omission due to the demands of a busy teaching load.

Defined very broadly, children with 'behavioural difficulties' characteristically shared a potential for experiencing a degree of exclusion from mainstream classrooms, a) for social or learning support or, b) for disciplinary reasons, which sometimes included Exclusion. School census data categories that shaped my Town School teacher questionnaire, referred to a type of educational provision which reflected a trajectory of exclusion for pupils in difficulties at school. Failure to conform with normative standards implicit in one category, pointed to the next category of educational provision. Ultimately, each category lead from partial to complete alternative educational provision for children defined as having disturbing and/or disruptive behaviour, or sebd. The school drew upon a range of strategies or supportive measures for pupils in attempts to address a wide range of problems that in effect prevented pupils from learning.

Strategies of support/control

Chapter One introduced School Liaison Groups (S LG), which reflects Scottish educational strategies for supporting children 'in serious trouble' within school

¹⁴⁶ In City School I found only one teacher who was not puzzled by the term, a teacher, who described herself as a 'learning support' teacher, discussed the meaning of sebd in comparison to the English and Welsh version EBD.

¹⁴⁷ See Appendix V as above, for the selection process used in both schools.

(Pickles 1992). SLG's act as collaborative forums, which offer a range of supportive resources, for example, social workers and doctors. In law, parents of pupils discussed among this group have a right to attend, in practice, a guidance teacher told me most parents are unaware of its existence and most teachers would not know about the SLG. At Town School guidance teachers took the decision to refer a pupil to the attention of this group, as indicated by their names appearing on the SLG meeting agenda.

In Scottish schools, a practice intended as a supportive measure for pupils described as, not seriously 'in trouble', but, of some official concern was referred to as being 'put on a sheet'. A colour coded 'sheet', carried by a pupil and offered to his/her teacher at the end of a class for comment, was also signed on a daily basis by parents.¹⁴⁸ Four kinds of 'sheets' provided teachers an opportunity to make written comment on a pupil's, behaviour in class, attendance at school, academic achievement in class. Finally, a sheet was used in City School that confined comments to one particular topic/teacher. Any sanction or praise a pupil received was noted. Pupils 'on a sheet' were generally known to a wide range of staff in terms of the kind of 'sheet' and in terms of other teachers brief appraisal of the character of a pupil's participation in each class attended.

In practice, teachers at Town School reported their use of a range of strategies for 'managing' pupils with 'behavioural difficulties'. In consultations among classroom and guidance and/or learning support teachers, pupils manifesting 'behavioural difficulties' were assigned to whatever strategy was considered to be most appropriate for the pupil concerned. Pupils' participation within these strategies was more or less temporary, depending upon how well they were deemed to be able to control their subsequent behaviour. Teachers reported that pupils with 'behavioural difficulties' tend to experience exclusion from class, either because they are 'sent out' by their teachers, or they exclude themselves by withdrawing from a class or school, officially referred to as truanting. Teachers described pupil's

¹⁴⁸ The research did not include parents' views in its design, nevertheless, the research showed the ways in which parents, whilst being legally responsible for the education of their child, in practice were marginal to everyday negotiations of schooling. Unless, that is, their child was in some form of formal 'trouble'. The sheets, for example provided an opportunity for parents to become involved in formal discourses between pupil and teacher albeit in written form.

behaviour in terms of *degrees* of 'behavioural difficulties', that is, as a continuum from not seriously 'in trouble' to those that were thought to be 'in serious trouble'. A broad category of 'in trouble' emerged as capable of transcending subtle but telling distinctions between 'behavioural difficulties', with a potential for official labelling as having SED and/or Exclusion, a subtle proof of Silverman's warning "... that the phenomenon always escapes" (1993: 201).

In the initial research design, standard grade 'performance' was included as a criteria to be used in the selection process precisely because Exclusion on the grounds of poor behaviour effectively restricts access to Standard Grade courses. During S3 academic profiles are produced by teachers that state a pupil's Standard Grade potential. As a main gateway to further educational qualifications and subsequent employment opportunities and choices of lifestyle, presentation at Standard Grade is crucial for pupils. Official literature shows that, "Very few excluded pupils were of above average ability; in the main, excluded pupils were evenly divided between average and below average" (HMI/Ofsted, 1995/6: 9). It was not possible to select pupils using this category as in practice pupils 'in serious' trouble were found to be in difficulties with learning, which was negatively reflected in their academic profiles.

In seeking to match pupils across the standard grade range of foundation /credit and general, revealed a *naive expectation* that children 'in trouble' would be found at *every level of academic attainment*. Pupils doing well academically were not found in the category of 'in serious trouble'. A failure in academic performance was a main issue of concern for teachers and parents of pupils referred to as 'in trouble'. Thus the point that being 'in trouble' has a negative effect on the chances of a pupil being presented for Standard Grade examinations emerged from the selection process.

S3 emerged as a good year to choose in terms of the substantive problem of in/discipline. Teachers in both schools considered the time that pupils spend in S3 is a crucial time in terms of the choices that youngsters make about their school work and their friendships. Teachers stated that pupils' reputations are consolidated during the course of the S3 year. Teachers consistently stated that in comparison with other year groupings, S3 is a time when a rise is noted in the numbers of pupils who are placed on 'conduct sheets'. Importantly, pupils labelled as 'in trouble' by some teachers were not so defined by *all* teachers, which suggests 'in trouble' is a matter which arises over issues of tolerance within a teacher/learner relation

(Rosser and Harré 1976). The category 'in trouble' allowed for selection of pupils who were defined as 'in trouble' in relation to rule breaking, for example failure to attend regularly or, on time and/or 'bad behaviour' in class. Finally, 'not in trouble' pupils consisted of those whose participation in schooling was considered to be 'normal', that is, pupils who were not known to break the schools codes of conduct expected of pupils.

Research Design: amended categories

To allow research to draw upon a breadth of pupil experience of in/discipline at school, a broad category 'in trouble' was adopted in place of sebd, whilst categories of 'equal numbers of girls and boys' from 'S3' were retained. The category 'in trouble' differentiated into three sub-categories, was operationalised as pupils who were described officially as: i) 'in serious trouble' (pupils currently referred to the SLG agenda), ii) 'in some trouble' (pupils currently participating in a 'sheet'), and iii) 'not in trouble' (by random selection from the school register of S3 pupils).

With help from the principle guidance teacher for S3, pupils were randomly selected by placing names in a hat; i) of all pupils known to be on the SLG agenda, and ii) on 'sheets'. The guidance teacher considered each selected pupil's degree of vulnerability and his/her capacity to participate in the research. On the basis of her opinion the pupil was selected for invitation to join the research. To illustrate the importance of the guidance teacher's contribution to this process an example is given of the first boy whose name came 'out of the hat'.¹⁴⁹ He was not invited to participate because his guidance teacher knew from his current personal circumstances that he might be too emotionally fragile. A short time later, the pupil was reported to have had a 'nervous breakdown' and arrangements were made for him to attend a special school for children with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties. This example was one of many that sensitised me to the fact that the reasons why pupils experienced difficulties at school, and how the school responded to those difficulties, were characteristically complex. Within the remit of

¹⁴⁹ This boy was one a number of pupils whose name was drawn, but, who on advice from the guidance teacher were not invited to participate in the research. This is an example of one of the ways in which trust is extended in research and without which it could not proceed.

guidance, teachers are evidently required to exercise great tact and discretion in providing support for pupils in everyday negotiations of learning and teaching.

Selection of pupils at Town School and subsequently at City School, confirmed a gender ratio found in the literature in relation to sebd and Exclusion; presented as support provision, more girls than boys participated in each school's liason group and 'sheets' activities. The salience of the category of gender was supported as a result of the above process. Anecdotal comments by staff, for example a story about four girls who ganged up on one boy and beat him up, indicated a general view among teachers that girls were becoming more difficult to control than they had been in the past. Arguably, the concept of 'femininity' characterised as passive and gentle, would be inadequate to account for these kinds of female action. In the research girls wanted to participate under conditions in which they felt most comfortable, which largely entailed spontaneous decisions to bring a 'pal' along to their interview. In practice, girls in both schools threatened to undermine research design specifications for equal numbers of boys and girls, and my attempts to gain participants' informed consent and parental permission. Boys on the other hand were more conforming, with one major exception. The salience of the research question 'why are more boys than girls Excluded?' reflected a live issue.

Research Design: how many schools?

Town School had been designated as a 'pilot' study, specifically for purposes described above, in preparation for the 'real' research to be carried out in two other schools (Hey 1997: 38 -54). Having refined the research 'instruments' two more schools were to be contacted in order to carry out a comparative study between them using the selection process, and in addition to pupil interviews classroom observation was planned, followed by class teacher interviews. These schools were to be selected on the basis of being similar in most respects, except for having differential rates of Exclusion. By matching schools according to a set of variables, for example the socio-economic status among children and the ratio of teachers to pupils, processes leading to Exclusion could then be compared. Drawing upon these variables, I expected to make comparative statements about Exclusion, as **valid** (cogency of the argument) and **reliable** (truth claim) statements that would be generalisable to other schools. By the time research at Town School was nearing an end, I made a decision to change the original research design with respect to the number of schools to be researched.

Analysis of official documents reported in Chapter One, showed degrees of definitional uncertainty between local education authorities. The Scottish Exclusions project revealed a futility of using the idea of cancelling out variables; researchers' work showed that some 'Leafy' schools had high Exclusion rates and some 'deprived' schools had low Exclusion rates (Cullen *et al.* 1996). This finding suggested a school's rate of Exclusion, as an outcome of its stated ethos towards its pupils, reflects the character of its 'school relations'. School effectiveness research shows that a school's ethos can effect educational outcomes (Reynolds 1982; Rutter *et al.* 1979; Mortimore *et al.* 1988). On the basis of theoretical interests in rule following, pupils' accounts of interactions within processes of everyday inclusion/exclusion that lead to Exclusion were focused upon.

By this time, a 'second school' had 'chosen itself'. Through use of a list provided by Scottish researchers in the Exclusion project, contact had taken place with schools reputed to be sympathetic to research, whilst avoiding those schools that had already had a surfeit of educational researchers in the recent past. Access to City School was nevertheless a very lengthy, delicate and difficult process. Eventually it was arranged through a chance comment from a guidance teacher about a colleague at another school who was interested in children 'in difficulties'. A fifth 'access to school' telephone call and a successful negotiation later, made contact with a future 'gatekeeper', Sally McNab.¹⁵⁰ Entrance was gained to a realm of micro politics (Ball 1987). Time and energy spent in arranging research, was conserved by inviting the total numbers of pupils originally planned, but in one rather than two schools. In this way it was hoped data would be created that was deep enough and rich enough to identify social processes of inclusion/exclusion among pupils.

Methods of research

The original choice of methods for creating pupil data remained unchanged. Pupil data were created through **video recordings** of focus groups and **taping** of interviews, all of which were transcribed verbatim¹⁵¹ and analysed. At City School, after their focus group experience and prior to their interview, pupils were also

¹⁵⁰ All names used in this research have been changed in order to preserve the anonymity of research participants.

¹⁵¹ See Appendix 11 for transcription notations used in this thesis.

observed in class over a period of two terms.¹⁵² **Field notes** of everyday encounters were written up on the computer and contributed to the analysis.

At Town School weekly data collection took place over a term. At City School data collection entailed regular, almost daily, attendance over two terms. Pupils participated in an initial **focus group** (three conducted in total, one at Town School and two at City School). Focus group discussion was stimulated by viewing selected clips from the movie *West Side Story*, chosen for its dated yet still relevant portrayal of young people 'in trouble' within peer relationships and with adult authority figures.¹⁵³ The film clips themes reflected research themes of in/discipline and Exclusion; they were labelled as 'behaviour in conflict with authority', how do people at school do 'femininity' and 'masculinity', and finally, 'how people end up being called bad'. Watching the film clips as a group provided pupils with two options, i) to offer comments about the action in the film clip, and/or, ii) to offer their personal experiences of the kind of troubled incidences portrayed in the film clips. This proved to be a fruitful strategy in the sense of giving participants some control over which topics were discussed and to what extent.¹⁵⁴ Pupils were asked to consider their discussion as private to those present.

Analysis of the Town School focus group transcript produced a set of substantive research questions that were worked into an **interview guide**, which included questions designed to collect limited demographic information regarding, age, sex, family details, place details and academic status as reflected in their 'setting' for

¹⁵² Pupils were asked to provide some brief points of information about their teachers and upon the basis of their replies four classes were selected for observation. See Appendix V111 for a copy of the form used at City School to find out which teachers taught the pupils I had interviewed.

¹⁵³ I particularly chose this film because I have very powerful memories of its startling effect upon my own perceptions of issues of social and cultural inclusion/exclusion. I hoped that its 'old fashioned' presentation would provide pupils with something that could help them transcend any awkwardness they might feel. In this regard it proved to be a good choice to make for girls and boys.

¹⁵⁴ In reference to footnote above, during the same conversation I learned that one pupil broke the rule of confidentiality that governed focus group discussion. When remonstrated with by the above participant, the rule breaker threw a chair at the remonstrator. The matter was not noticed by, or reported to, teachers, nor to me. Principled aspirations to keep participants 'safe' emerge as contingent upon the principled co-operation of participants themselves.

Standard Grade examinations. All pupils participated in an **in-depth qualitative interview**. During interviews, pupils were asked to reflect upon topics raised in their focus group interview and given an opportunity to introduce their own perspective on each topic discussed. Burgess remarks that the "... hall mark of being a field researcher is ... flexibility in relation to the theoretical and substantive problems at hand" (Burgess, 1984: 143). Flexibility within the interview guide allowed pupils to introduce related topics, which had a positive effect in that specific sensitive topics and events were discussed. Personal interviews provided us with a mutual opportunity to clarify these matters. At City School, the focus groups were carried out, and the Town School interview guide, after minor changes, was used with City School pupils. Analysis of all three focus groups provided an opportunity to compare pupils' talk between schools (Morgan 1988).

All teachers directly involved in the research process at Town School and City School were interviewed.¹⁵⁵ At City School two male janitorial staff and a female librarian were also interviewed. Senior teachers at both schools participated in selection of pupils. Subject to their availability and preparedness to participate in an interview, class teachers were selected, partly in order to create a gender balance, and partly because they knew the pupils participating in the research. Basic demographic questions regarding sex, age, family and professional details were asked of all adults as a way into their particular views on in/discipline and its relation to gender. Teachers were asked to illustrate a general point of view by giving a description of an actual experience thus building in a degree of teacher critical reflection (Gouldner 1970). All interviews with teachers in Town School were written up from notes taken during the interview, due to my lack of confidence time I did not ask them to be taped. In contrast to Town School, interviews with teachers at City School were **taped**. All adult interviews at City School were subsequently transcribed and analysed by hand.¹⁵⁶

At City School, classroom observation brought class teachers more directly into the research frame, a decision that reflected the research aim to explore 'bad behaviour'

¹⁵⁵ For City School, Class Teacher Interview Guide, see Appendix X, and Discipline and Guidance Staff interview see Appendix X11.

¹⁵⁶ City School teacher interviews were not typed up on a computer because I had broken my left arm. I could write with a pen, but, could not use my computer for about six months.

within actual interactions, between participant pupils and their teachers; and between pupils within and between gender categories.¹⁵⁷ Although not a specific feature of the research design, data emerged which showed ways in which teachers' gender is significant for pupils at the level of 'gender relations' (See Chapter Eight). Significantly, data regarding inclusion/exclusion of minority ethnic pupils emerges as requiring research in its own right (See Chapter One).

Interactive researching: on intended/unintended consequences

Social researchers have a moral obligation to participants, that in so far as is reasonable a researcher must ensure the participants are not **harmed** or **upset** by the process.¹⁵⁸ This research had *and* has a potential for harming children, especially those who were inordinately vulnerable for a range of reasons and thus the research could be defined as,

"... research which potentially poses a substantial threat to those who are or have been involved in it... while there are cases where research makes demands on participants which are quite substantial, the potential costs in the case of sensitive topics go beyond the incidental or the merely onerous (Lee 1993: 1).¹⁵⁹

Lee divides research into three broad areas where it might be expected to be threatening to participants (Lee, 1993: 4). First, research may be defined as an 'intrusive threat' when it deals with private, stressful or sacred areas of social life. Second, when research involves the revelation of information that is stigmatising or incriminating, where participants risk the 'threat of sanction' for example, in study of deviance and social control. Third, research into 'political' questions may impinge on powerful interests whether of persons or institutions in revealing the exercise of coercive or dominating power. Evidence in support of Lee's three concepts can be

¹⁵⁷ Choosing to conduct research with twelve pupils in one school, rather than six pupils in two schools, helped me to gain depth and breadth of information about specific events.

¹⁵⁸ See Appendix 111, as above, for a discussion about 'informed consent' as it relates to children in educational research and what to do in cases of disclosure of abuse, particularly 'sexual abuse' of children, in which I provide a discussion of a distinction that the research drew upon between confidentiality and privacy.

¹⁵⁹ It emerged during the time of the research that two pupils explained their reasons for participating in the research were precisely because their situations were vulnerable, to a degree that they had attempted to commit suicide.

drawn from data.¹⁶⁰ Jessie feared the research as an 'intrusive threat'. Jessie's 'presentation of self' brought to mind Simmel's dictum that, 'Of all the protective measures, the most radical is to make oneself invisible' (Wolff, 1950: 345).¹⁶¹ During her participation in a focus group Jessie kept her face covered at all times, either with her fringe or by drawing back in her chair so that her face was covered by the body of the young person next to her. Lee argues "The powerless and disadvantaged may fear exploitation or derogation or be sceptical about research" (Lee 1993: 7), and that some participants may have high expectations that research can provide a remedy for the powerless. One participant Ross, risked the 'threat of sanction' as he just 'disappeared'. This placed me in a difficult position, as arrival at classes to which he had agreed to be observed and to which his teachers had also agreed, brought repeated attention to his absence. In contrast, Gary explicitly stated he participated in the research in the hope that he could contribute to finding ways to stop boys bullying other boys. Drawing upon the work of Sieber and Stanley, Lee writes,

... that while the threat posed by research most obviously affects research participants it may also impact on others. These include the researcher, but also the family members and associates of those studied, the social groups to which they belong, the wider community, research institutions and society at large (Lee 1993: 5).¹⁶²

Drawing upon Barnes, Burgess discusses this problem to argue that remaining silent is a 'political' act (Burgess 1984: 189-194).¹⁶³ With regard to Lee's third concept of 'political threat' Exclusions is a 'political' question and I feared what I would find, and how I would substantiate what I did find.

Authors describe researchers in terms of field roles (Burgess 1984; Janes 1961; Silverman 1993). Critical of the idea of 'roles' experience of research led to

¹⁶⁰ A fuller description of pupil participants follows in Chapter Four.

¹⁶¹ See K.H. Wolff (1950) Chapter Four, 'The Secret Society', Section 1, 'Protection and Confidence': 345 -348.

¹⁶² See Lee (1993) for his discussion of these matters in which he draws upon Sieber and Stanley (1988); Lee and Renzetti, (1990); and Bailey, (1988).

¹⁶³ See J. A. Barnes (1982) 'Ethical and Political compromises in social research' in Burgess 1984. Problems around the issue of confidentiality may arise when social research is disseminated quickly (Barnes 1979: 203) or when the place is well known (Morgan 1972).

characterisation of a network of relations among participants. Relations with participants were set up in terms of the research information, in which those *directly* involved were given a choice to participate, but as discussed below, in a social context research can have unintended consequences that are real in their effect. No claim is made to have entered a private world of gendered pupils (Ball 1987; Measor and Woods 1984; Mac an Ghaill 1988; or Aggleton 1987; Lees 1993). Nor was an attempt made to create non-hierarchical relations between researcher and researched (Oakley 1981; Finch 1984). A professional presence was maintained although, I often felt like an intruder, I became a familiar and largely accepted person in City School, tolerated as long as professional boundaries were maintained and respected. With a necessarily sensitive regard for the feelings of participants in relation to their everyday lives, the distinction was made clear to pupils between social workers, as generally concerned with individual children and young people and their families, and a sociologist. Albeit in more colloquial language, the latter was described as concerned to explain Exclusion as emergent from within their collective experience.

An obvious power difference which age and the quasi-technical and scientific kudos that goes with saying 'I am a researcher from such and such a university' was self consciously acknowledged. A researcher *is* in a position of power, however, in practice *social power did not seem to be the significant issue*. If the research questions were to be addressed at all, a prospective participant had to choose to participate because he/she was, a) **interested** in the research, and if yes, b) whether it was possible within existing **conditions**, to carry out research according to the design specifications, and c) how much a person would say depended upon his/her perception of me as a **trust** worthy person. Negotiation of mutually appropriate times to meet and managing differences in personal energy became the central challenge for participants *and* me. The research depended upon 'making time' to talk, finding a mutually comfortable place in which to talk, with access to a supply of electricity that ensured discussion could be recorded without worrying about the state of batteries. After the tape was turned off, I learned to note comments 'made at the door', as these were often of significance in terms of illuminating actors meanings. The problem of keeping **boundaries** of privacy and trust between participants was experienced in terms of their ongoing relationships outside the research process.

As a measure of self-protection and protection for respondents relatively formal boundaries between me and participants were established. I always 'signed in' at school reception so that my presence was 'official' although, I was relatively free to come and go as I pleased.¹⁶⁴ Formal boundaries were observed whilst smiling and being courteous at all times. Adult people were always called by their surnames, whilst pupils were asked what they wished to be called, and they generally called me by my surname. In anticipation of the possibility of being asked advice about, bullying, or drugs, or disclosure of sexual or other kinds of abuse, information had been brought to give to pupils in such an eventuality, material published by the *Scottish Child Law Centre*.¹⁶⁵ Successful research relationships in the field required a great deal of tact and discretion as some pupils, *and* teachers, were inordinately emotionally vulnerable due to experiences at home *and* at school. I attempted to empower research participants by being clear about the limitations of research in terms of short and long term effects. I did not attempt to be a 'friend' although steps were taken to make participants feel at ease. Sometimes *I felt* uneasy, for example one of the pupils really irritated me.

The interactive approach with participants reflected this thesis's theoretical perspective; discussions were viewed as an 'interactive encounter', which required participants to be given the space to direct discussion whilst my interview guide questions were covered. Participants, pupils and teachers talked a great deal about how they felt at school. By offering my own feelings towards matters discussed it was hoped to mitigate power differentials as much as possible. I believed this approach was mainly successful. At Town School, for example, as one male pupil left his interview, he popped his head round the door and said "I enjoyed that very much, I hope it goes well". That is quite a statement from a 14 year old boy, especially one who had just told you quite a bit about his sexual relationships (Wolpe 1988).¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁴ My field research took place not long after the shooting of children in Dunblane Primary School with the result that City School required all visitors to sign in and wear an official visitors badge.

¹⁶⁵ See for example, 'telling about child abuse and what happens next' produced by Scottish Child Law Centre Lion Chambers, 170 Hope Street, Glasgow G2 2TU.

¹⁶⁶ See Wolpe's argument that the "... type of information boys give a female researcher is likely to differ from a male researcher" (1988: 160), however, in my experience it was the

Informed consent: on being 'trapped at the back' of a classroom

Burgess considers researchers must be flexible 'in the field', whilst noting a frequent criticism of qualitative research methods is reflected in the substantive issue of researcher presence; how far does a researcher's presence influence the generation of data? (Burgess 1984). My presence in one City School classroom certainly did influence the generation of the data in a way that required considerable flexibility!¹⁶⁷ Mulling over Burgess's remark sharpened my understanding of methodological positivism implicit in his question. Social scientists cannot stand 'outside' their research. Burgess addressed problems of integrating different accounts of the same situation by comparing his experiences with Cicourel and colleagues (Burgess 1974: 144). Cicourel *et al.*'s 'indefinite triangulation', a method of collecting a number of accounts of people involved in the same classroom, provides,

... details of how various interpretations of 'what happened' are assembled from different physical, temporal and biographically provided perspectives of a situation (Cicourel *et al.* 1974).

Cicourel's point bears a remarkable similarity with Garfinkel's account of reflexivity. Theoretically, the following account of experience in a classroom reinforced a confidence in choosing interactionist research methods of research, whilst indicating that the difficulties of interpretation of motive within particular circumstances is central to creating an account. Conduct is normatively ordered, however, "... actor's knowledge is evaluated in terms of its agreement with the 'facts of the situation' as determined by the scientific observer" (Heritage 1984: 29). Actors challenge the legitimacy of that knowledge in seeking to reach valid agreements (Habermas 1987).

Field notes recorded a particular classroom observation, which derived its name from a male teacher's account of his perception of my situation as 'trapped at the back' of his classroom. As part of the English curriculum, a film clip had been viewed, which in effect created a charged atmosphere in the class. Its topic, a gang fight between groups of young males, was more explicitly aggressive than the gang fight from *West Side Story* shown in the focus groups. After it was shown, pupils

kind of rapport that emerged between researcher and interviewee that was crucial in gaining depth and breadth of description about the topic under discussion.

¹⁶⁷ Reflecting upon the adjective 'flexible' I came to consider these matters a problem of reflexivity, and discuss that problem in relation to reputations in Chapter Five.

were asked to produce a written comment on the film. I was sat at the back of the classroom observing one particular boy, near the front. A group of boys, sitting directly in front, began to challenge my presence through a series of increasingly derogatory and sexually explicit references to mothers, clearly intended to be overheard. The boys were astute in framing their challenge to the 'stranger' in their midst; I am a mother, as well as a researcher. As a woman of 50 in a class of 14-15 year old pupils it was impossible to disguise age differences. Pupils in the class began to notice the teacher's failure to respond to the boys' actions. The boys continued, their voices grew louder. The teacher made his way slowly to the back of the class, ostensibly to call the boys' attention back to their work. The teacher was faced with a dilemma, on the one hand if he penalised the boys, my presence in classrooms would become a topic of pupil discussion which could possibly have limited further classroom observations. On the other hand, the maintenance of his rightful authority required a disciplinary response. He, I and they were literally saved by the bell. Salient to the research questions, male pupils' verbal aggression towards me could have led to disciplinary responses if the bell had not terminated the class.

Reflection on the experience and giving it a place in the research brought home the limits placed upon pupils' exercise of power in classrooms. One of the boys involved told me later that he thought I was a spy planted by the school to tell them about 'bad' kids, arguably a rational response that I had not intended (Boudon 1982). Whilst the form of their challenge was a bit hairy, their challenge was not unreasonable. The actions of pupils involved in the challenge could have wrecked plans to observe in the remaining classes. A teacher's decision to act when that power is negatively exercised was evidently not a straightforward matter of applying disciplinary rules. It transpired later, that the teacher shared my views, but was profoundly glad that the bell had ended the lesson when it did or he would have been forced to take disciplinary action.

This account of being 'trapped at the back' of a classroom is evidence that despite attempts to conduct the research on the basis of 'informed consent', in education 'informed consent' is always partial and fragile. Obtaining participants 'informed consent' is best described as a formal event in a negotiated process that characteristically entailed on-going negotiation of different interests within 'school relations'. The negotiated character of 'informed consent' derives from the principle that participants can withdraw at any moment from a research process. Actual

signing of a consent form constitutes a formalisation of that process, and field notes record, "Access is an ongoing process not an event secured in one go." From the moment research begins, the process continues until a researcher creates written accounts prepared for examination and/or explanation of the problem, and eventual dissemination to wider research audiences.¹⁶⁸ Published accounts of social research ultimately have a life of their own.

Boundaries of trust: on forgetting to turn on the microphone

Negotiating boundaries of trust and privacy within research relations were crucial to carrying out the research within its design specifications. The gaining of trust and ensuring privacy within research were issues brought sharply into focus by Rhona and Jessie, two S3 girls from City School. Rhona and Jessie's experience of and impact upon the research illustrates the mutually constitutive link between ethical, methodological and epistemological problems in social inquiry. Both girls participated in a process of being informed, of giving their consent, and obtaining their parents' permission for them to participate. On the one hand, participation gave them a legitimate reason for absenting themselves from classes they did not like. On the other, participation threatened their desire to maintain a veil of secrecy over their movements at school. In practice, Rhona and Jessie's participation in the research was characteristically ambivalent, both girls changed their minds on a number of occasions (Rattansi 1992).¹⁶⁹ A major reason for their ambivalence was that they worried their parents might be informed of their actions at school as a result of the research. Their continued inclusion as active participants in the research required on-going sensitive negotiation of their separate, but, common concerns. Experience with them highlighted the point that participation in the 'public conversation' is not necessarily desired by young people (Roche 1996). The nature of their ambivalence was understood, but their participation was crucial for me as they were selected on the basis of being 'in serious trouble'. Very few girls 'fitted' that category, and it was too late in the research to be able to integrate new girls that by definition were vulnerable. Rhona and Jessie were eventually

¹⁶⁸ For a discussion of these issues see Lee and Renzetti, 1990; Brewer, 1990a; Sieber and Stanley, 1988; Siegel and Bauman, 1986.

¹⁶⁹ Again I cannot expand upon these points too much as participants could well be identifiable.

interviewed, which they took as an opportunity to talk about different forms of exclusion at school. In the final event, it transpired that I failed to *record* the interview with Rhona and Jessie. Attention during interview was so focused upon their feelings as vulnerable young women, that I forgot to activate a tiny microphone that was separate from the tape recorder. They kept their part of the bargain, they spoke, but, no tangible evidence of that discussion was obtained. As in social life, contingency is a feature of social inquiry.

In order to carry out the research, within a tight schedule of interviews, I was required to trust that pupils and teachers would turn up, as well as trust that they would speak as truthfully as they dared. Researchers inevitably find personal and professional loyalties tested by social inquiry, for example, when gaining information 'in the field' situations arise where a researcher is faced with having to **lie** to one person in order to maintain confidentiality with another, or are faced with having to lie in order to maintain the all important integrity of the research (Burgess 1984).¹⁷⁰ Teachers were largely concerned to keep professional boundaries of loyalty to their colleagues, whilst articulating their personal views of teaching and handling difficult situations. Pupils too were keen to be seen as loyal to their peers and most pupils *expected teachers* to be loyal to *other teachers*. The topic of participants experience of incidents of in/discipline at school and its relationship to punishment and/or support, had potential for seriously compromising on-going relationships. Pupils principle concern about me was that I could be trusted not to *embarrass them in front of their peers*. Under constant pressure of time, and in front of differentiated audiences, the building of trust emerged as a matter of mutual necessity, for me in terms of conducting valid and reliable research, and, for them in terms of their on-going relationships at school.

Data analysis

Characterised as an iterative process, data analysis began with the first discussion with head teacher at Town School and the teacher responsible for pupils with special educational needs (Bryman 1988; Robson 1993; Tesch 1990). Similarities and differences within the first two accounts regarding the topic of sebd and in/discipline given at Town School were noted. Field notes contributed to verifying

¹⁷⁰ See Burgess (1984: 201 -203) who cites S Box (1978) *Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life*, London: Quartet, for a discussion on lying in the field.

and checking serendipitous points made 'on the stair' (Merton 1968). Gathered in the passing, these 'fragments of detail' helped the cross checking that contributes to the reliability of statements of findings made in qualitative research (Delamont 1992: 149 -162). Analysis began to make headway through careful reading of transcriptions and by making made copious analytical notes (Silverman 1993: 196-211). Topics commonly raised by participants were noted, and links with my topics were observed. The idea of using electronic data analysing packages had been rejected as too time consuming in terms of learning the technology, in favour of concretely handling text through a process of cutting and pasting text onto topic cards. At this point in the data analysis as I was beginning to regret earlier decisions regarding data analysing packages. During a serendipitous casual conversation on the street with a member of the computer support staff, I was told about a simple linguistic package called Concordance, which was available on the Internet. Concordance allowed me to sort and organise discussions evident in interview transcripts in a way that corresponded with my analysis to date (Riessman 1993).

Pupil and teacher data created a 'discursive world' in which participants, as speakers and hearers, clearly had things to say about experiences in relation to incidences of in/discipline. To make sense of the data analysis material was sorted and organised in terms of three main questions; what topics do participants talk about? what kinds of things do they say about the topics? and do participants refer to these topics as gendered? In subsequent chapters, data are presented to illustrate discursively produced links between teachers and pupils as they encounter each other within everyday 'school relations'. The thesis attempts to make convincing links between problems of social inclusion/exclusion and Exclusion at school, based upon data produced with participants, treated as interlocutors, within the research as outlined above. The presentation of data in the chapters to come raises questions about 'external' validity, which Burgess defines as "... the data ... obtained in studying one situation (as generalisable) to other situations" (1984: 144). Such a question can only be answered by those who consider data as fairly represented, and if so, a reader asks, am I convinced this account has general validity?

Summary

This chapter has highlighted problems of accounting for social inquiry in its presentation of a process of 'field work' that led to changes in research categories and research design, in the light of understanding social life as discursively

produced. Constrained within local conditions, the reflexive character of accounting pointed towards the negotiated character of everyday life. Ultimately, the validity of research claims rely upon a demonstrated coherence of 'fit between' research problem, research questions, research design and theoretical resources used to interrogate data produced in the process.

In this particular case, the research problem is well recognised, boys relative to girls are disproportionately removed from mainstream education, for having 'behavioural difficulties' or for actions which were officially labelled as 'disaffected'. Official labels for pupils experiencing social, emotional and/or behavioural difficulties in mainstream schooling, for example, were not adequate to examining the gendered and negotiated character of being 'in trouble' at school. The chapter argues that validity and reliability of research findings relies largely upon a researcher's negotiation of research relations, insofar as they enable relevant and significant actors to act as interlocutors within research.

The chapter's descriptions of methodological and epistemological problems show how ethical practice entails careful negotiation of research relations. The chapter argues general principles of ethical practice, that require a researcher to maintain participants privacy and anonymity, i) apply to children and young people in as much as they do to adult research participants, and ii) research with children and young people heightens these problems in that they are not necessarily cognisant of potential short and long term harmful consequences of speaking out. Despite best intentions to protect participants, (those who have been through a process of 'informed consent') as social inquiry was conducted the research had an impact upon pupils and their everyday process. Classroom observation, for example, was shown to have a potentially harmful impact upon pupils who by virtue of the fact of being present were *indirectly* included in research. Schooling emerges as a significant social process; interactions among actors at school are **viewed, talked about and judged**.

Chapter Four

Social and educational inclusion/exclusion of pupils

Membership is more than attendance

Introduction

This chapter presents schools and schooling as social institutions in which youngsters gain a 'self' and a 'social identity' as a person and as a pupil. This chapter draws upon pupils' recorded perceptions of 'self' and 'others' and recorded observations to present pupils who directly participated in the research.¹⁷¹ The chapter discusses the importance of social acceptance relative to being perceived as 'academically able' among peers at school. Social acceptance at school is shown to be an outcome of continual negotiation of everyday social relations that impact, either negatively or positively, upon actor's academic experience of schooling. Some pupils evidently withdraw voluntarily from social interaction, but do their school work, whilst others withdraw from school to become labelled as 'truants'. The chapter presents three cases of 'skiving' to show the dialectical relation between social and educational processes at school. Pupils' reflections on 'skiving' and its negative effects show social and academic relations at school as mutually constituted in everyday interactions.

Schools as social institutions

Schools, materially located in time and place and arguably organised according to the same legal rules and regulations, are recognisably similar whatever period is examined. Pupil movement around a school is characteristically triggered by a sounding of a bell or buzzer that divides a school day into timetabled blocks (Thompson 1991). The sound signals a mass movement of bodies, young and older, around actual physical space. Pupil movement creates a basic need for rules to secure the health and safety of pupils and teachers (Woods 1990b). Pupils must act

¹⁷¹ Descriptions are necessarily brief in that detail has a potential for identification of individuals.

in accordance with rules that organise where, when and how pupils find their way about the building, whilst acting in socially acceptable ways in relation to teachers and other pupils as they do their school work. Teachers allocate pupils in time and space, decisions that shape pupils' participation in the curriculum. Schools are social institutions in which people necessarily socially organise human and material resources in providing pupils with actual lessons. Chapter One has outline the contract between parents and state, which supports the argument that all pupils have a social and educational entitlement to be an accepted member of the school. It is not always the case that pupils' accept that entitlement, or accepts that the school is meeting their social and educational needs. A school cannot be expected to meet the entitlements of actors within it, and that includes pupils and their teachers, if its legitimate authority is not accepted. Constrained within wider networks of other relevant educational institutions, decisions about these concrete matters are socially negotiated within *local* formal relations (Ball 1987).

Despite these common constraints, research into comprehensive education across the UK has showed experiences of secondary schooling are dissimilar. Pring and Walford (1997) for example, describe educational research responses, circa 1979, to demands for a return to 'selection' of pupils for different types of secondary schooling on the grounds that 'selection' produced better overall examination results than comprehensive schooling. Noting the findings of re-ananlysis of three studies of examination results¹⁷²Pring and Walford write,

All of the studies found that there were far larger differences between examination successes of different schools of the same type than between average examination result of different systems, even after such factors as social class had been taken into account ... The most important finding from those studies is that individual schools differed greatly in their effectiveness (1997: 5).

¹⁷² See Pring and Walford's (1997) account of three studies of examination results, by Marks, J., Cox, C., and Pomain-Srsednicki, M., 1983, *Standards in English Schools: An analysis of examination results of secondary schools in England for 1981*, London: NCRE; Steedman, J., 1983, *Examination Results in Selective and Non-Selective Schools: Findings of National Children's Development Study*, London: National Children's Bureau; Gray, J., McPherson, A. F., and Raffe, D., 1983, *Reconstructions of Secondary Education: Theory, Myth and Practice since the War*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. Pring and Walford suggest critics hoped a re-analysis of data collected during these studies would provide evidence to settle the 'selection' dispute in one way or another. Data were not collected with this purpose in mind, a point that fuelled controversy following publication of the findings.

Pupils draw differentially upon differentiated social and cultural resources to support them in their educative process. Geographical locations modify pupil activity, for example Town School is located in a large green space where pupil movement is clearly visible within and to some extent, beyond the school boundary fence. In contrast, City School is located in a built up urban area where pupils can move relatively unobserved, in and out of the school, at all times of the day. 'Skiving off' for the day, or part of a day, is therefore easier to accomplish without formal detection for pupils at City School. Differences of these kinds contribute to a school's distinctive social 'atmosphere' and pupil activity within it.

In recent official publications former use of the term 'atmosphere' is replaced by the term 'ethos', for example the HMI's Audit Unit publication, *How Good is Our School?*, which lists 'performance indicators' to enable schools to carry out a self-evaluation of its 'ethos' (Edinburgh: SOED 1996). A school's 'ethos' is argued to reflect a school's culture. Research has led to a characterisation of a school's 'culture' as 'inclusive' of all pupils or 'exclusive' for pupils whose cognitive and/or social characteristics 'fit with' a school's conceptualisation of a 'socially acceptable pupil' (Munn 1999).

Some schools recognise they are a haven for troubled children and hold on to them; others are less willing to do so. We once again encounter the importance of school ethos in explaining the differences in exclusion rates from schools with very similar kinds of pupils (Munn 1999: 412).

Pupils whose lives are lived under conditions of severe material and emotional deprivation are effectively treated less equitably than their more fortunate peers. Distinguishing between pupils on the grounds of an 'exclusive ethos' is arguably discriminatory in its effect as the state's statutory obligation is to provide pupils with schooling, where possible in their locale and in accordance with their 'learning needs'. Arshad argues that despite the kinds of difficulties many minority ethnic pupils encounter at school they should receive comparable treatment with majority peers (Arshad 1992: 60 -64). In Scotland, pupils come from complex social and cultural backgrounds, thus the practical implications of establishing a school's aspirations towards its pupils is important.

State schools' public statements of its 'ethos' express a 'moral order' that creates expectations of how teachers and pupils will treat each other or put another way, sets out a 'whole school approach' to its aspired 'moral order'. Macbeath *et al* note,

in an evaluation of their school, pupils and teachers arrived at the consensus that classrooms *should* be places where learning was fun and achievements of all kinds would be celebrated (MacBeath 1999; SOEID 1996). Action judged as appropriate in a social order is a moral matter conveyed by the language of 'should' and 'ought' (Crossley 1986). Authors describe a school's 'ethos' through the concept of 'discipline', in association with a set of 'values', as applied and taught. However, teachers may *or* may not have a 'personal' ethos that accords with a school's formal statement of its ethos. Teachers and pupils hold distinctive perspectives on what kinds of 'values' a school holds and its 'ethos', especially with regard to how those 'values' are achieved (SOEID 1998b). Both schools in this research aspired to treat people fairly and with respect, regardless of social or cultural difference, an 'ethos' that management expect classroom teachers to apply to pupils. Critically, Woods (1990b) cites Stubbs (1976) to write, "We have noted the supreme symbolic importance of language" and problems of understanding between teachers and pupils (Woods 1990b: 92).¹⁷³

Chapter Two has outlined the character of rule following in everyday interaction, which challenges the notion of 'discipline' as governed by 'taken for granted' rules and regulations. In practice, it is a particular experience in which rules are *learned from* and *constituted by*; Pitkin writes,

The real meaning and full significance [of rules] is completed only by the concrete cases from which they derive, and is accessible only to someone familiar with those cases, with the practice. These principles, and the corresponding practice, are both *learned from* and *constituted by* particular cases (Pitkin 1972: 55).

Theoretically, differences of opinion regarding action emerge and are resolved in social interaction by reference to whatever set of rules (those that are formally negotiated and codified in official discourses) or social norms (those that are informally negotiated in everyday social relations). Teachers and pupils must necessarily negotiate social relations that constitute two social 'orders', a 'formal order' and a 'informal social order'. Tattum notes Blumer's argument that 'It is the

¹⁷³ See Woods (1990b: 92) for a discussion that reveals an emphasis upon a pupil's understanding of a teacher and the "efficacy of a school ethos" as something that is 'applied' and not 'communicated' in a Habermasian sense of a reaching a mutual agreement, and therefore a rational and just agreement, a perspective addressed in Chapter Six.

social process of group life that creates and upholds the rules, not the rules that create and uphold group life" (Tattum 1982).¹⁷⁴ Unhappy 'school relations' raise questions regarding the character of negotiations that seek to resolve disagreements between teachers and pupils. The character of such negotiation is arguably reflected in the character and quality of a school's 'atmosphere'.

Schooling is primarily a social experience during which young people form a sense of 'personal' as well as 'public' social identity, which exemplifies the dual role and purpose of schooling in relation to children, and ultimately for society. In its broadest sense and with respect to children participation in and benefit from schooling, a key process in socialisation, arguably prepares pupils for citizenship in a democratic society (Parsons 1999).¹⁷⁵

Teachers at school

Professionally qualified and formally appointed, it is teachers who, at the 'chalk face', organise and provide education for pupils (Connell 1985:1 - 5). Kirkwood (Bryce and Humes 1999) reiterates Brown and McIntyre's description of a 'good' teacher as one who is able to create a relaxed and enjoyable atmosphere in classroom, able to retain control of the classroom, able to present work clearly and interestingly, so motivating pupils to work well (Brown & McIntyre 1993, cited in Bryce and Humes 1999: 425 - 434).¹⁷⁶ Teachers are expected to act positively in creating an orderly learning and teaching environment. Chapter One discussed how teachers' in state schools create regular accounts of a pupil's time at school (SOED 1993a; SOED 1993b). Teachers in Scottish secondary schools are differentiated by subject, in relation to guidance and organised within three main hierarchical

¹⁷⁴ Tatum (1982) draws upon the work of H. Blumer (1969) *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.

¹⁷⁵ See Carl Parsons (1999), whose functionalism reflects that of his predecessor Talcott Parsons.

¹⁷⁶ The 'new sociology of education' of the early 1970's, for example, Bowles and Gintis' *Schooling in Capitalist America* generally failed to say much about teachers. Subsequent research focus upon teachers in the late 1970's, for example, on the social construction of the 'good teacher', in Grace, G. (1978) *Teachers, Ideology and Control: a study in urban education* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, and the 'hidden pedagogy of survival', in Woods, P. (1979) *The Divided School* London: Routledge Kegan and Paul, and in, Barton, L. Walker, S., ed. (1981) *Schools, Teachers and Teaching*, Lewes: Falmer.

groupings, senior management staff, principle teachers in subject departments, and class teachers by subject (Peterson 1992; SED 1968; SED 1971; SED 1995 (March). Each grouping takes formal responsibility for different aspects of pupil experience of schooling, for example class/subject teachers are generally assigned registration classes where a teacher makes a formal record of pupil attendance/absence. Class/subject teachers teach specific subjects whilst managing the day-to-day social interactions between pupils during class. Teachers may be class teachers in promoted posts within their subject department. Teachers may also be largely concerned with management, as a depute head, as assistant head, who may have additional pastoral or disciplinary duties attached to their management role. Class teachers are supported by learning support teachers, specialist teachers and guidance teachers. Although conceptually distinct, the division of labour among teachers may mean a teacher who is directly involved in class teaching may also be formally appointed as a guidance teacher (Ozga 1988)¹⁷⁷.

At the level of social organisation and interaction at school the teacher/learner relation is a key formal relation, within the 'negotiated order' that comprises 'school relations' (Bonner 1990:18-35). Comprehensive schooling introduced to secure 'equality of educational opportunity', arguably provides all children with access to the same type of school, the same quality of teaching, a broad and balanced curriculum and access to publicly recognised examinations and qualifications (McPherson 1992). In Scottish secondary schools, for example it is expected that all pupils be presented for core Standard Grade examination, which consists of a number of levels or bands within three main heads; Foundation (F), General (G) or Credit (C) level (SOED 1993c; SOED 1993d). In practice, pupils at S1 level are assigned to subject teachers in classes that are 'setted' to a degree, for example in Foundation/General (F/G) classes or General/Credit (G/C) classes. Theoretically,

¹⁷⁷ Ozga's (1988) sociological analysis of teachers work represents a re-emergence of a Marxist analysis of the logic of capitalism, to argue teachers are being deskilled by government policies with respect to the curriculum. Mac an Ghaill (1994: 33) cites Ozga's thesis, that "... the logic of capitalism determines a continual reformulation of jobs, working on the principle of separating conception from execution", which he supports with examples from his data, to suggest teachers are being demoted from 'professional' teacher to 'facilitator' of a national curriculum that is understood to effect an increasing control of classroom practice by government.

pupils can be relocated into different bandings.¹⁷⁸ Chapter One argues organisation of pupils within their "... age, ability and aptitude" has a negative impact upon pupils. In state schools, the continuity of debates regarding the content and adequacy of the curriculum is normatively pertinent with regard to pupils categorised as 'less able'¹⁷⁹ or 'disaffected'¹⁸⁰.

In recognition of the fact that pupils' personal and social lives are demonstrably complex, differentiated by changing material and emotional circumstances, pupils in Scottish comprehensive schools have an entitlement to guidance at all stages in secondary education (McLaren 1996). Guidance staff are formally responsible for developing more informal and supportive relationships with pupils by assisting pupils with any social and/or learning difficulties they may encounter at school (MacBeath 1988). Guidance staff play a central and pivotal role in the allocation of pupils into classes, determined partly on the basis of limited 'knowledge' of pupils' academic and behavioural history derived from pupils' primary school records. Guidance staff may be called upon to make interventions either by pupils or a class teacher to assist in finding solutions to a range of problems that adversely influence learning and teaching (Betteridge 1999). In the course of their work teachers at every level face the task of responding to degrees of in/discipline at school. Guidance teachers play a central role in taking up matters relating to pupils who persistently break formal rules or expected social norms at school through the strategies referred to in Chapter One and Three.

¹⁷⁸ Ball's (1981) study of Beechside Comprehensive, is one of a range of classic studies that illustrate negative educational and social outcomes of banding pupils according to IQ.

¹⁷⁹ The National Record of Achievement, introduced partly in response to Gow and McPherson's presentation of the views of 'non-certificate' pupils, in *Tell Them From Me* (1980) Gow and McPherson, and partly in response to the SCCC's concern regarding inadequate record keeping of pupils achievements, does not carry the status and cache accorded to conventional educational certificates (McLaren 1996: 422-423). The process itself is considered important in building self esteem for individual pupils. Crucially, guidance staff invest time and energy in helping pupils prepare these documents.

¹⁸⁰ See Furlong, V. J., (1991) *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 'Disaffected Pupils: reconstructing the sociological perspective.' vol. 12, No. 3: 293-307. More recently see, S. Hobbs, 'Disaffection with schooling' in Bryce and Humes (eds.) (1999) *Scottish Education* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Betteridge outlines the history of guidance and its association with 'personal and social development' to note its relatively late addition to National Guidelines, issued in Scotland with respect to the curriculum and assessment. Guidelines to schools in, "... reiterating and endorsing the point that 'personal and social development is embedded in all learning' " urge for a cross-curricular approaches. Guidelines also call for a 'special focus approach' " ... to concentrate on 'issues which pupils have identified and raised as being important or which others have identified as being important for the pupils'"(SOED 1993a: 3). The SOED called for the creation of a "... a warm caring supportive atmosphere in which all individuals, pupils, staff and parents know they are valued" (SOED 1993a) as a preferred 'whole school' approach (MacBeath 1999). Should attempts to **include** children into the culture of schooling fail, either **academically** and/or **socially**, senior teachers have authority to Exclude pupils' deemed to have seriously broken school rules and norms that refer to matters of general or personal safety (SOEID 1998a). Senior management teachers, such as the head teacher, or deputy head teacher, contrast with guidance teachers in that they are responsible for formally attending to matters of serious in/discipline among pupils. Head teachers are ultimately responsible for overall leadership in a school and its formal order as reflected in what is variously called a school's 'ethos' or 'culture'. In creating and maintaining formal authority of a school *and* its teachers, teachers draw upon codified rules to establish formal relations among them and pupils. As social relations, variously described as 'performed' (Goffman 1959), as lived' (Smith 1988), Chapter Three argues that formal relations are 'negotiated' in everyday life at school. Chapter's Six and Seven draw more directly upon social relations as 'communicated' (Habermas 1987 [1981]).

Social worlds of schooling

Pupils' accounts describe social relations at school as constituting 'social worlds', a concept that does not carry connotations of rigidity or bounded-ness associated with traditional uses of 'group', rather it carries sociological connotations of between-ness (Strauss 1993: 47). Similarly, 'social worlds' challenges traditional notions of 'pupil culture' or 'youth subculture' as 'resistance' to a dominant culture (Bennett 1999). The concept of 'social worlds' helped explore distinctive social realities, which I encountered first in Town School and then City School, each producing its own nuanced discourse and particular elements of *trajectory* (Strauss 1993: 212). In a Goffmanesque sense, 'social worlds' implies the fluidity of everyday

social life as a series of 'encounters' within and between 'social worlds' (Goffman 1959). Young people described 'social collectivities', of pairs, triads and larger social groupings that formed in public spaces around school as constituting social **audiences**. Pupils talked about what they or other pupils did inside and outside school, for example where they went when they 'skived' from school.¹⁸¹ Young people's perceptions of social difference provide a catalyst for discussion and comment in which pupils attempt to attribute meanings to action. Young people described their self-conscious attempts to present themselves in gendered ways thought to impress those among them whose opinion mattered most. Ellen described a common view among girls that boys perceive girls as one 'audience' they wished to impress.

Ellen: Boys will act big in front of girls rather...

As they reflexively accounted for a range of interactions at school (Heritage 1984) pupils described three main forms of exclusion within their social relations; 'voluntary', 'forced' or 'unintended', which pupils largely explained in terms of negotiating social differences among them. Chapter Five and Six draws upon pupils' descriptions of these social processes.

Young people reported gaining a sense of 'self' as a person and as a 'pupil' within different 'social worlds'. Ball notes, "... the classroom as a social setting is made up of two worlds"(Ball 1981: 49). Young people choose to include themselves academically at school by doing the work of a pupil. Young people described choosing to exclude themselves from lessons part of the school day or even whole days at a time. Accounts of the state of truancy and in/discipline in Scottish schools, for example The Pack Report (SED 1977) reflects an historical continuity of 'self' exclusion from school. Pupils who choose 'self exclusion' risk official labelling as 'truants', which official, professional and academic literature variously refer to as 'disruptive' and 'disturbing' of 'others' and 'disaffected' from their own schooling

¹⁸¹ The impact of events and relations in the world 'outside' school upon pupils experiences at school, both positive and negative, is well recognised. However, I cannot begin to give an account of pupil's descriptions of what they did when they 'skived' from school, because the thesis could not do that task adequately. The important point for this thesis is that pupils to some extent bring the 'outside world' into school through talk. See Carlen *et al.* (1992) for an indepth treatment of what pupils do when 'truanting' from school and the law's response to pupils and their parents/carers.

(Furlong 1991: 293-307). A pupil cannot legitimate his/her decision to exclude self no matter how reasonable, in his/her own terms, their decision may be.¹⁸² Data show pupils do not necessarily share the same understandings of or attribute the same significance to formal rules and/or social norms that govern their interactions at school.

Pupils at school

Biographical descriptions of pupils who directly participated in research are organised and presented as data according to pupil selection categories 'in trouble' and by 'gender', not as an 'objective' statement of 'cause' and 'effect' about why he/she might be 'in trouble', but to show that despite the compulsory and formal character of schooling pupils actions at school are significantly influenced by how they feel, for example comfortable or uncomfortable (Mayall 1998; Prendergast & Forrest 1998). A pupil's sense of 'self' emerges as significantly shaped by his/her social acceptance among peers and teachers, which is reflected in a pupil's sense of his/her social inclusion/exclusion among peers in their everyday interactions. Pupils social and academic 'identities' emerge as mutually constituted within the collective experience of schooling.

¹⁸² Mr Lawrence Demarco, a member of the Pack committee, and a youth and community worker for the City of Edinburgh, did not feel able to sign the Pack Report, but, was allowed to prepare a statement that was presented at the end of the report. Demarco's statement reflects his thinking about children who choose not to go to school in conditions where who teaches them, and what they learn is experienced as profoundly irrelevant or seriously uncomfortable. Demarco (1977) writes, "Children who keep away from such experiences or who behave disruptively in relation to them cannot be assumed to be disturbed or delinquent. To refuse to acquiesce to what is subjectively experienced as a damaging influence will always be a legitimate human response often requiring great personal integrity and courage... So I would say that we are overdue a fundamental debate around the compulsory aspect of schooling. When we look at its disastrous effect on the basic contract between the teacher and pupil we really have to ask whether the compulsion is worth the distortion it causes" (SED 1977).

Boys 'in serious trouble' at school (SLG)¹⁸³

Chapter Three outlines a form of selection carried out in both schools, processes that led to direct participation in the research by four S3 boys. Categorised as 'in serious trouble', Ross, Paul and Matthew attended City School and Phillip attended Town School.

In contrast to Matthew and Paul, Ross had always attended City School. Ross is referred to in Chapter Three. I had personal contact with Ross for only *fifteen minutes*, during which time I thought I was negotiating his informed consent to participate in the research. Despite my being in the school for two more terms, I never saw him again, but his 'co-presence' (Giddens 1984) in everyday pupil discourse provided evidence of the social power of 'reputation' at school.¹⁸⁴

Ross is described by other pupils as having a high social status at school. Ross is generally described by girls, boys *and* some teachers in positive tones and in a variety of ways; as "sexy", "independent" and "a nice boy". Some teachers rejected Ross as not worth bothering about, in contrast to his guidance teacher who worked hard to facilitate Ross's potential to do well at Credit level in the Standard Grade examinations. Ross made *his own* decisions about which lessons he was going to attend. Pupils knew him to be involved in a network of older boys outside school. Pupils and teachers mentioned the possibility of drug taking as the central activity which identified the network to which Ross was perceived to belong. He excluded himself socially *and* educationally by 'skiving' from school. Ross had never been Excluded from school and my last 'hearing' about him was at an SLG meeting where his case was discussed in terms of *further* supportive strategies in continued attempts to keep him in school.

¹⁸³ See Chapter Three for detailed discussion about the category 'in trouble' and its three sub-categories: i) 'in serious trouble' (SLG), ii) 'in some trouble' (sheets), and iii) 'not in trouble'. The reader is reminded that Scottish secondary schools are officially expected to form a **School Liaison Group** (SLG) by drawing upon a range of specialised professionals able to offer alternative forms of support for pupils deemed to be 'in trouble'.

¹⁸⁴ See Chapter Five, which discusses various kinds of reputations, used at school to refer to others in everyday discussion and the positive and negative effects experienced by social actors as a result of being known in terms of a reputation.

Paul's parents had recently arranged for him to be transferred from another High School, as a strategy to avoid Paul being Excluded. Paul thought his relationships with teachers in his old school had almost broken down. His one experience of Exclusion had taken place four years earlier, in Primary Six. Paul had a 'bad' reputation that came to City School with him.¹⁸⁵ He himself, like Phillip, wanted a 'good' reputation as he described the implications of having a 'good' reputation as meaning a person is perceived as, "... good in school (achieving educationally) and good behaviour and have a lot of friends."¹⁸⁶

Paul perceived himself as socially included in saying, "I'm not boasting but I've got more than enough friends, I've got friends all over." Paul seemed to have made a few friends in the short time he was at City School, however he seemed to have been socially accepted by boys who constituted an 'out' network of City School. My observations of Paul's interactions with other boys *and* girls in class and in the playground noted him as energetically tactile, in a way that just fell short of what might be described as aggressive in comparison with other boys or girls.

Paul's account of his social relations among other boys at his old school included a number of stories of fights between boys where one boy in particular was badly hurt. Paul was friends with the boys responsible for an attack that Paul described as racist. He did not approve of the attack because of its racist intention, however he described how difficult it was to avoid future social interaction with the attackers. Paul said, "Sometimes I would just tell them to go away but I don't know, I wouldn't leave my pals because I ken anytime I leave them, I always start mucking about with them." In contrast to Phillip, whose attempts to change his pals had been more successful in that he was not alone in wanting to change, Paul had been moved to a completely new set of social relations. He had not been formally Excluded, but nevertheless *effectively* experienced exclusion from his old school.

Paul's perception of himself as social accepted and included in friendship networks contrasted sharply with his perception of himself as not accepted by teachers. Paul

¹⁸⁵ See a discussion later in the thesis, in an account of a 'yuffty' class, about my impressions regarding how Paul was 'known' by teachers.

¹⁸⁶ Chapter Five describes and discusses pupils' creation and use of reputations in everyday talk at school.

described how he found it difficult to hear in class. " Well she (his English teacher) talks too low cos Ah spoke to ma friend and he goes, he said to me, 'you're no deaf', Ah says 'how?' and he says 'even Ah cannae hear her'. She just mumbles under her breath sometimes... so Ah said, 'Ah just I cannae hear ye'. She asked me once if she needs to speak louder and Ah said, 'aye' and its a'right now." It was never clear if Paul did have a hearing problem. Paul described himself as interested in school work, however during observations of him in classes only once did he appear interested and engaged in what he was doing and that was in a PE class. By chance I met Paul a year later when told me he had transferred to an FE college where he was currently studying PE. Paul sounded more interested in his education. He explained that PE was of direct interest to what he wanted to do as an adult, which was to work in the area of sports.

Matthew, like Paul had come from another school. He arrived at City School having been Excluded from a prestigious fee paying school. Matthew generally wanted to be included socially and educationally, however his interactions with pupils and teachers were often contradictory. Sometimes he was really co-operative and sometimes he appeared to 'lose' his 'cool'; for example, during the research Matthew was informally Excluded for a day. In his interview I asked Matthew, "When I came to find you ... you'd been informally Excluded, what was that about. Can you feel able to talk about that? Matthew replied, "Well it was just my temper gone in the class ... (with) ... another pupil." I asked, "And did you hit them?" Matthew replied "No, I just swore at them." I then commented, "Well that's interesting because I've heard lots of people swearing. Did you swear very loudly? Matthew agreed with a rueful look, "Yeah, a bit too obvious!"

Although 'swearing' was common between pupils, as Matthew implicitly indicated above, pupils 'know' that they have to generally conform to the explicitly stated rules. My question possibly ought to have been more 'detached', for example I could have asked him if he had 'spoken' too loudly. It struck me at the time that 'swearing' among pupils did not automatically lead to a formal sanction, thus I reasoned to myself his teacher must have had to intervene to prevent the interchange escalating to an unacceptable level of noise. Matthew's comments illustrate everyday distinctions between language that may be socially acceptable between pupils, which is sanctionable in the formal setting of a classroom. Pupils must observe these social distinctions to avoid getting into trouble with teachers.

Matthew's comments also indicate how Matthew was aware that he could react dramatically towards other pupils when he was annoyed for some reason. It could be argued that he effectively excluded himself. Whilst Matthew was often in the company of boys who were known as 'hard' boys, all pupils treated Matthew with caution. Other pupils in interviews made unsolicited references to him as 'mad' and 'bad' and although he wanted social and educational acceptance he described himself as feeling, "... but I don't really care sometimes." Other pupils were of the opinion that Matthew was so desperate to make a friend at school that his intensity put people off his overtures of friendship.

Matthew told me he took 'Ritalin' tablets, which he described as having the effect of helping him concentrate on his work. Matthew described the tablets as helping him to control the emotional pull of the social atmosphere around him in class. "... It sort of shuts the people outside you out a bit... You can do your work, you can behave." Behaviour in this sense emerges as 'performative' action defined in reference to official codes of conduct.

Phillip drew a distinction between formal Exclusion, which he had not experienced personally, and informal exclusion from the classroom. He also drew links between these two practices in that both forms had negative educational effects. Phillip thought Exclusion as a punishment for 'bad' behaviour had the educational effect of "No being able to learn anything at school, because you're no learning anything if ...What I mean like is if you get Excluded you're not going to be doing any work you're only going ...you'll have a lot to do at school when you get to go back."

Phillip who had only experienced one high school, described himself as having been the 'class comedian' in his first few years at secondary school. Phillip's teachers had excluded him from his classroom on many occasions because of his unacceptable social interactions with other boys. He had experienced a range of other sanctions used by his teachers in attempts to control the effects of his 'disruptive behaviour'. Phillip had been 'sent out' and given punishment exercises and detentions.

Phillip described his experiences at Town School as largely shaped by the pals that he "hung about wi". Phillip was socially included in a network of 'bad' boys and known as one of the 'bad' boys, that is, he had a reputation for being a 'bad' boy. Phillip wanted to make changes in how he was known at school and thought that the way to do that was to change his pals. His perception of a need to change his

'bad' reputation raised an important issue for him; he thought a change of reputation *depended* upon his being able to change his pals, that is, to withdraw from a network of 'bad boys' who did not do their school work. Phillip thought by socially excluding himself from a negative social network and by choosing a new set of pals he could change his reputation with teachers and be seen as serious about his school work. Phillip and a few other boys, had made a decision to "keep away fi" a network of boys who regularly got 'into trouble'.

The above descriptions of boys 'in serious trouble' at school is necessarily brief, but sufficient to indicate strong connections between social and educational inclusion/exclusion. I now turn to describe the girls in the study who were 'in serious trouble' at school.

Girls in 'serious trouble' at school (SLG)

Chapter Four introduced Jessie and Rhona, girls selected for this category at City School, whilst girls at Town School included Lillianne, Adrienne and Karen.

Rhona and Jessie were S3 girls at City School where Jessie experienced considerable exclusion from social interactions between girls, and between girls and boys. Jessie, for example was called 'mad' to her face by a boy at the end of a class. Jessie was described as 'odd' by pupils and other adults. Jessie's fringe hung in her eyes, whilst she screwed her eyes up a lot and used the fringe as a curtain. One had the feeling that she hid behind the fringe when she did not want to participate in what was going on around her. Rhona and Jessie were not part of the 'in' group, membership of which was defined by participation in the breaktime ritual of a 'fag outside the school gate'. The girls went to the school toilet for their illicit smoke, often in registration class. Jessie appeared to be socially on the edge of a specific 'out' social group referred to by others as the 'Chinese girls'. Jessie appeared to handle these painful social experiences by 'choosing' which classes she would attend, for how long she would remain in the class, and thus effected her own educational exclusion.

Jessie was described as hard to 'communicate with' and in her communications with other people, she adopted strategies of inclusion/exclusion to avoid or achieve informal or formal contact. Jessie would 'disappear' by silently leaving a situation. Jessie ignored the teachers she did not like. If she liked a teacher she would remain very physically close to the teacher, following the teacher about the class. Teachers

evidently colluded in Jessie's use of strategies of self exclusion. In an open plan classroom area, for example I observed Jessie, who knew that I was observing her, quietly leave the room. The temporary teacher was aware of this event, but chose to ignore it.

Jessie wore a pair of jeans and the same black cotton bomber jacket everyday (she never took it off). She looked a 'poor wee soul' with a screwed up face most of the time, who contrasted with Rhona, an S3 girl from the same minority ethnic background as Jessie, described by them as Hong Kong Chinese. My abiding memory of Rhona is of an elegant and well dressed girl who appeared to get on with her school work. Rhona was socially included by other youngsters who 'looked' as if they came from her ethnic background. Rhona was perceived by other pupils to 'chum about' with other 'Chinese' girls (MacIntosh 1990).¹⁸⁷

Despite stark differences in their presentation of self (Goffman 1969) which made their association remarkable, I had the impression that Jessie was 'cared' for by Rhona, in acting as her interpreter. Rhona said that people always found it difficult to understand Jessie. The two girls were relaxed with each other and obviously shared secrets. Rhona did not share in the obvious social exclusion that Jessie experienced.

Rhona educationally excluded herself by 'skiving', often in the company of Jessie. They both described how boring and hard they found their school work and had managed their boredom by excluding themselves from lessons for much of S1 and S2. In S3 their self exclusion was highlighted by some minor shoplifting in the local community. For these combined reasons, their cases had been presntnted to the school's liason group.

¹⁸⁷ MacIntosh's account provides a good discussion of the complexity of social experience among pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds. In this research, some minority ethnic girls and boys were observed as and reported to mingle as respected people within a range of social networks. However, it was also true that groupings were commonly differentiated most obviously by a shared minority ethnic appearance.

Lillianne's response to my question about Exclusion, which was posed as "do you get sent home from school?"¹⁸⁸ led into an interesting discussion about the various ways in which 'exclusion' is understood at school. Lillianne said, "... Excluding means ... if ... is it like are you talking about a bad way or is it if your feeling unwell?" Lillianne had a comprehensive knowledge of processes of Exclusion, better it transpired than many of the teachers I spoke with. Lillianne was clear that senior teachers jointly decided to Exclude a pupil. She had been informally Excluded a couple of times, but like Phillip she drew an empirical distinction between *informal* Exclusion and a teacher using the sanction 'sending out' a pupil from the class. She too described both forms as negative in their effect as she thought they led to a loss of teaching and learning.

Lillianne was philosophical about school work, she said, "Mm mm. I like most of it, but some classes I just can't stand. But I have to go to them because that's life." However, Lillianne also described lessons as boring, that she did not like anything about her classes, "Everything. The teacher that teaches me and the work they do. The works boring, the teachers never stop shouting." Lillianne described how she frequently excluded herself from classrooms by deliberately provoking her teacher, knowing eventually that she would be 'sent out'. Lillianne was frequently late for school. The only reason she offered was that she walked slowly to school knowing that she would be late.

Lillianne perceived herself as socially included and referred to lots of 'people' as friends, girls and boys. Her social network of girls, however were perceived by some girls as 'the 'bad' girls'. It transpired that Lillianne and Adrienne were in fact the, "'bad' girls, really 'bad' girls!" referred to in my initial chance playground conversation with pupils during my first visit to the school. The extent and detail of their troubled social relations among other girls became apparent during interviews at Town School. Lillianne described a number of incidences that illustrated she generally experienced conflict with teachers about her ways of relating with other pupils, especially when her interactions with them threatened learning and teaching. Teachers often sent her 'out into the corridor'.

¹⁸⁸ The category 'sent home from school' is one of the ways that Exclusion is masked in school records. See, for example in the Scottish research carried out by Cullen *et al* (1996).

Issues of social inclusion/exclusion were central matters discussed in Adrienne's interview. Adrienne, an unexpected participant in the research, had known Lillianne for a long time. Some of that time they had been best friends, however they had been through periods where they had 'fallen out' with each other, about problems in their relationship that included differences of opinion about boys. Currently they had new best friends. Adrienne was known as a 'bad' girl and perceived herself as a 'bad' girl, nevertheless she wanted to have a 'good' reputation among her peers. Her 'bad' reputation, that of 'slag', had been assigned to her by boys whom she had 'gone out with' (See Chapter Five).

Adrienne described informal Exclusion in the following way, "Exclusion means that you've went too far, you've sort of ...you haven't stopped while you were ahead, you went too far with the teachers and they've got you excluded, chucked out of school. They give you a punishment and if they give you a detention that it wasn't enough, it didn't go through your head, that you were too bad, so you didn't stop while you were ahead and the teacher's just had enough of youse so you've had to get chucked out."

Adrienne had been informally Excluded more times than she could remember. Adrienne described her social and formal concerns as tangled and as a problem of self/ discipline, " Like when I'm really good I could sit there and do my work and when I'm bad I just sit there and do no work and just be cheeky and talk to my friends, not listening to the teacher." Adrienne wanted to do well at her lessons, but found the work too hard. Adrienne found it difficult to separate social and formal relations, for example, she was not able to keep control of her responses to others, even within class. Adrienne was frequently 'sent out of the class'.

Karen was a girl 'in serious trouble' at Town School. Karen's main problem at school lay in her social relations among girls. She told me that other girls, 'bad' girls, taunt her and call her 'mad'. Her troubled social relations with the 'bad' girls were sufficiently serious for her to attempt suicide. Karen is socially included by another network of girls, however she does not trust these girls because in the past they have gone to the guidance staff to tell them about Karen's experiences of being bullied by the 'bad' girls. Karen's only confidante was Gary (see below) who quite by chance had been included in the research, had also experienced bullying to the extent that he too had tried to commit suicide. Their similar experiences of social exclusion at school was the basis of their friendship and mutual trust. Karen and

Gary's experiences indicate that inclusion/exclusion in school relations is an outcome of interpersonal choice and trust.

I asked Karen if she had a place of privacy and someone she could speak to about her problems? Karen replied, "Yeah but only wi' Gary. Nobody else ... I wouldna go and talk to ANYBODY in this school ... ANY of the teachers... no way! They'd go straight back and phone your mum! done that before ... Its ... I want her to know as much as I'm wanting to tell her... but other than that I'm no wanting her to know."

Karen was in danger of Exclusion because she sometimes became very angry with other pupils to a degree that she was of official concern as indicated by her name appearing on the SLG agenda. Karen described informal Exclusion as , "If you've done something wrong that shouldn't have been done ... you're sent home from school and your barred ... banned from school for so many days. When you've *really* done something wrong." Karen's view of pupils who were 'sent out' expressed the problem of social inclusion/exclusion in terms of audience, "Because they're no wanting... they're no bothered... they want to be seen as what they're looking... as hard at school and other than that who cares... they live for the present ... that's what I think."

Karen had never been Excluded nor was she a pupil who was ever 'sent out' of the classroom for disrupting the lesson. Karen described herself as an 'outsider' as she had chosen to transfer to Town School after one of the other High Schools in the area had been closed. Karen, who wanted to succeed at school, had perceived Town School as a 'good school' and worked hard at her school work. One network of girls excluded Karen socially by 'taunting her', which created a key problem for her school work experience as the 'taunting' did not stop at the classroom door. Karen wanted to be a medical doctor, and thought that her serious conflict among other girls had negative effects upon her educational achievement.

Boys 'in some trouble' (sheets)

Elliot, Mahmood and Terry are S3 boys at City School. Terry and Mahmood were invited for interview during classroom observations. Tony was included as a way of exploring in more depth an event which took place during classroom

observations.¹⁸⁹ Mahmood was chosen at a point when Jamie 'changed his mind' I was concerned to maintain the numbers of boys in the study, although Jamie 'changed his mind' again (See below).

At General Standard Grade Science classes I noticed that Mahmood, an S3 boy, worked alone to quietly get on with his learning. On one occasion after the class had gone out his teacher told me Mahmood had had difficulties with another boy in that class; the other boy had been repeatedly unpleasant to Mahmood who had reacted aggressively. It was then that I learned that Mahmood was on a 'behavioural sheet'. This information contrasted strongly with my overall impression of Mahmood as a calm and purposeful young man. Later in a particularly noteworthy 'yuffty' class, where the atmosphere was tense, I noticed the teacher attempting to insist that Mahmood sat at a table with other boys.¹⁹⁰ However, teachers generally appeared to accept Mahmood's choice to work alone rather than in a pair or small group in the way that was customary among other pupils. They understood Mahmood's choice as a strategy for avoiding further aggressive encounters. Mahmood described himself as having a reputation for having 'behavioural difficulties', but he had not been Excluded from school.

Mahmood repeatedly expressed his desire to be socially included with other boys who made his life very stressful and unpleasant through constant verbal taunting. Mahmood thought his poor dress and 'unstylish' appearance were key things that separated him from other boys. Mahmood's *desire* to be socially included among boys and, to a lesser extent among social networks that included boys and girls, contrasts with his *capacity* to 'fit in' with everyday social activities of high public profile 'cool' people at City School. He described discos and parties (he did not attend) as 'normal' activities for other S3 pupils. Mahmood came from a family with strong family and cultural links with Bangladesh. He described himself as a practising Muslim. In his opinion his beliefs and values did not cohere with the beliefs and values of his peers. He considered his peers to be sexually forward, for

¹⁸⁹ See Chapter Two for a description of the event called 'trapped at the back' during a classroom observations of Elliot in his English class.

¹⁹⁰ The significance of pupils perceptions of 'yuffty' classes as evidence to support a 'relational' approach to understanding Exclusions will be addressed later in the thesis.

example, which was unacceptable to him and lead to his feelings of ambivalence towards participating in social activities that involved alcohol and/or possible sexual encounters. Mahmood's account exemplifies Halls' view, "A further consequence of ... politics of representation is the slow recognition of the deep ambivalence of identification and desire" (Hall 1992: 225).

Elliot contrasted very strongly with Mahmood. Elliot spoke with an English accent, although he had been born and brought up in Scotland. Elliot could be described as having the appearance of the quintessential middle class school boy, his school activities involved learning a musical instrument which he carried about. Elliot's parents had earlier negotiated a place in City School for their elder daughter. The school was seen as a 'better' school and more appropriate for their daughter whose experience at primary school had been one of social exclusion on the grounds of 'being posh'. Elliot's sister had enjoyed her social and educational experience at City School; ironically Elliot's perception of his social exclusion by many of the boys in City School was on the grounds of *his* 'being posh'.

Elliot 'talked in class' a lot. He was 'sent out' of the classroom on many occasions and described being 'sent out' as having a very negative effect on his school work. The more Elliot 'skived' from school the more he fell behind in his work. His attempts to limit the negative educational effects of his absence from class 'annoyed' other pupils, by his constant questioning of teachers during lessons. In classroom observations where Elliot was present, I got used to hearing him chatting and challenging points of school work; his 'talking in class' became a background noise for me. Elliot described himself as complaining strongly to his teachers as he objected to being 'sent out' of the classroom. Elliot was aware of his reputation for being 'annoying' especially in relation to his constant questions to teachers to explain bits of the lesson that he had not understood. It is not clear if these factors contributed to his social exclusion by many of the boys, however he was described by girls, boys *and* some teachers, as 'annoying'. Elliot was observed by me and described to me as socially accepted by an 'out' group, that largely consisted of girls, in a non-cool network of 'sad' pupils.

Elliot illustrated one of his experiences of becoming socially excluded in reference to a new boy that he had been asked to befriend. The new boy found Elliot 'annoying' and began to 'slag' him. The intensity of the 'slagging' made Elliot's male friends

avoid him because they did not want to be 'slagged' by the new boy, who quickly gained social cachet within a network of 'hard' boys.

Elliot's participation in a 'sheet' came about because he began to 'skive' from school for social reasons. Elliot described how social inclusion felt, "It's good, it's a nice feeling." He had experienced being 'in' and a friend, and the pain of being gradually put 'out'. Elliot described how his 'fit with' an old friend changed partly due to the 'slagging' by the new boy and partly due to the fact that his old friend seemed to change. Elliot said, "It's weird because we used to always ... we used to always 'hang around' together and do different things and now he's like smoking and drinking and he's a out of control. I don't know whose fault it is or how it happened." Elliot's perception of the 'sheet', used as a way of monitoring his 'skiving', was that it simply added fuel for other pupils to add to the 'slagging' fire. His 'talking in class', partly about socialising and partly about clarifying points of school work that he did not understand, effectively socially and educationally excluded him in a dialectical spiral of exclusion as people literally tried to 'shut him up' by withdrawing from him.

Terry was a boy who gave an impression of bursting with energy. His teachers comment when I went to negotiate how he felt about Terry missing two periods of English was, "If you want to spend two lessons with him then take him!" The tone of his voice implied that I must be 'off my head'! Terry had never been Excluded from school, although he had been put on an 'achievement 'sheet' to encourage him with school work in the expectation that he would behave more appropriately in class. The 'sheet' represented a strategy to avoid his Exclusion.

Terry understood social exclusion at an interactional level, "It's when you're an outsider." Terry perceived himself as socially included, making a distinction between 'inside' and 'outside' groups. He said, "I've got quite a good group of friends. But I sometimes look at people, and some folk would slag them, but sometimes I look at them and I feel sorry for them, because they've got no friends. And it's sad to see them walking about on their own when all of us are having a good time." Terry acknowledged that he 'chummed about' with boys who often got 'into trouble.

Terry perceived significant connections between social and educational processes at school, where he considered the most important aspect of school as making friends,

which effectively meant his social acceptance in everyday activities of school. "Your school work is important but you need a good atmosphere around you because then [without it] you won't like coming to school. You might be good, brainy and all that but you won't enjoy it. You have to enjoy it and like it. When we go out into the playground, some folk just go into the library and sit on their own doing their homework. What kind of life is that when you could be out going to the shop to get something to eat and talking to your friends? I think it's important that you make friends." Terry owned to 'skiving' once but he thought it generally as an indication of not having friends. Terry explains 'skiving' as a coping strategy that pupils used in attempts to manage unpleasant social relations at school.

Girls 'in some trouble' (sheets)

Susie and Lauren S3 girls at City School shared a personal history having been in Primary school together. Susie could not be described as a 'quiet' person as her energy and vivacity made a room hum. Susie had become very much involved in an 'outside' school social scene, which had led to her 'skiving' from school. Susie had appeared to other pupils in the 'cool' scene to have rejected them in favour of other 'social worlds'. Susie had explained, "It had absolutely NOTHING to do with my friends at all nothing it was just ... once you start you can't stop! Because I 'skived' five weeks of physics... because once you start you're behind and I mean you go in and you've got catching up and that and you just... AH I CANNAE DAE IT and then you've got a test and then you think well I've not done that unit so you just 'skive' all the time." Strong connections between social exclusion and educational exclusion are well illustrated by Susie's case of 'self' exclusion. Susie had participated in an attendance 'sheet' which her guidance teacher had then changed to an achievement 'sheet' in order to help her recover lost educational ground. Susie bitterly resented the 'sheet' process and often did not bother to present it for her teacher's attention.¹⁹¹

Lauren had lots of friends, a boyfriend and described spending a lot of time thinking and talking about these relationships, especially in class time. Although her style of dress and her activities were similar, Lauren was marginal to the 'school

¹⁹¹ I discuss Susie's case in more depth in Chapter Five to show a gradual unfolding of her being known through a process from informal labelling to official label.

gate network', which she was associated with largely through Susie. Lauren was mainly associated with girls and boys who met at a 'smaller school gate'; an 'inside' person of an 'outside' social network, 'outside' that is to the 'cool' network.

Lauren described herself as struggling with her education, especially in a key subject English. Lauren described her relationship with her English teacher as "not good", which made her learning more difficult. Lauren 'skived' from classes she did not enjoy, a 'short term' decision regarding 'self' exclusion from school that exacerbated her problems with getting her school work done *and* her social relations with teachers, particularly with her English teacher. I now turn to describe the boys and girls who were deemed 'not in trouble' according to the criteria of the research, arguably the category of 'normal' pupils.

Boys 'not in trouble'

Rory and Gary are S3 boys from Town School and Jamie and Robin are S3 boys at City School.

Rory described himself as a 'popular' boy well liked and able to influence his social position among boys. His social relations with girls were patterned along traditional lines in that he described girls as 'other', less as potential friends and implicitly as potential sexual partners. Less traditionally, his degree and kind of sociability, defining himself as a 'natural talker', often got him into trouble with his teachers in class. His lively account of his social experiences and his problem of talking too much in class led me to expect that he would be 'in trouble'. As a researcher, I experienced difficulties in remembering that Rory was *not* officially labelled as having 'behavioural difficulties'. He defined his trouble as "not serious trouble". Rory said teachers responded to his 'talking in class' by saying, "Rory, don't talk", that's it." The educational effects of his chatting in class were evident in his school report. Rory said, "Its just on my report it said like it'd need a radical change cos he needs to get his head down and work more." Rory accepted his school work suffered and particularly stated he liked teachers who would tell him to "get on with your work". My impression of Rory was that he was charming and funny and significantly, he knew when to stop talking 'in class'.

As a socially well liked and integrated boy, especially with other boys, he was able to challenge social decisions to exclude a person from a shared activity. Rory illustrated this point when talking about a boy he called a 'sad' boy, "... he'll join our

group....and people will say 'what are you doing walking with us?' I just say 'aw that's, just leave him, let him walk with us, he's no doing any harm walking with us' he's just..." Rory evidently had sufficient personal kudos among his male peers, to risk associating himself with a 'sad' person. I came to know that this 'sad' person was generally treated like a 'social leper'.

Gary's social kudos among his peers offered a direct contrast to Rory. Gary experienced a lot of bullying from other boys and like his particular friend Karen, had previously attempted suicide. Nevertheless, Gary did well at his school work and was working hard to get his Standard Grade examinations. Gary recognised the connections between exclusion from the job market in later life and poor school results, " ... today, if you haven't got the skills to do certain things, you have to have the knowledge in here [available at school] to do a job and... jobs are really demanding, like... you have to pass your Standard Grades and your Highers and *they* [the boys who bully him] won't know this. *They* don't understand that if they're misbehaving their work slips so ... ". Gary indicated a pragmatic view of schooling as necessary in the 'short term' and as having a 'long term' impact on the future.

Jamie described himself as belonging and having friends at City School. Whilst commenting upon the existence of socially distinctive networks of friends, Jamie did not think conceptually in terms of being 'in' or 'out' in the way that other pupils did. He described membership of a network implicitly in terms of being able to chat to people, "There's like - there's groups that I see in my year and like you just never get to chat to people... ". Jamie perceived a high status network at school which he described as boys and girls who share talk and activities, "Well they're quite mixed sometimes, because there's the good pupil that will hang round at the gates smoking and they'll like mix and they'll hang round together. I don't really talk to any of them." I asked him if that was because he did not smoke. Jamie said, "I've never really smoked. It's not just because they smoke, it's....." After a hesitation, I tentatively asked, "They're not your pals?" Jamie said "No". I asked, "Are you unhappy about that?" and Jamie said, "No". The above question was asked in order to clarify my observation of an interaction between Jamie and Pierce, a boy sat opposite him in an English class, which particularly stood out in my mind.

The following interaction took place before the interview when I asked Jamie to describe his perceptions of what had happened. Over a period of eighty minutes Jamie was persistently and deliberately provoked by Pierce, a much bigger boy and

a central person in the 'school gate' network. A feeling of tension around the interaction was evident in their faces. The bigger boy's face wore a 'hard' expression as he kept careful note of whether the teacher could see him. Jamie's chubby soft face maintained a scared smile; his attention completely held by the bigger boy's actions. Pierce threw nine objects at Jamie beginning with paper, then rubbers, then pencils and finally a ruler; all Jamie's school equipment. Jamie remembered the interaction, which he described as, "Yeah, he gets told off a lot because - I wouldn't say he's violent but you know, he's like that, he throws stuff and hits people and stuff like that." Jamie said that he wasn't frightened by the boy. "No, because I mean I know he doesn't want to hurt you, he's just like a bit hyperactive. He gets told off quite a lot." Jamie used the expression "... he get's told off a lot" like a mantra of hope. Jamie did not possess the social cachet that I perceived Pierce, who as a 'cool' boy, enjoyed among his peers. Jamie's responses to questions about being happy at school were hesitant and his transcript suggests that he was happier in S3 than he had been in S1 and S2 partly because he could choose his subjects, and because "It was quite good to make new friends as well".

Jamie did well at school and particularly enjoyed history expecting to do Standard Grade General to Credit. In classes, I observed that Jamie chatted a lot in class, but seemed able to get a balance between talking and doing his school work. Jamie had never been informally Excluded or 'sent out' of his classroom. His view of people who 'are 'sent out' or are 'expelled' is that they probably deserve it, as Jamie's understanding of Exclusion is that it is " ... It's not a straightaway thing I don't think." Jamie understands Exclusion as a 'last resort' event at the end of a process of persistent 'bad' behaviour. Beyon noted that boys expect other boys to 'act like a man', in his descriptions of what he calls 'routine violence' (Benyon 1989: 191 -217).

Robin, is an S3 pupil who 'fitted' pupils descriptions of a 'swot', who described himself as a 'loner', a view corroborated by my own observations of Robin. Practices that gave rise to these separate labels appeared to feed one into the other with a positive educational effect for Robin, who produced good academic results. Robin approach to his school work was stimulated by his desire to get good results and by his capacity to focus on his school work. Robin's academic aspirations were to get all his Standard Grade examinations at Credit level. Some subjects he studied at General level, whilst hoping to attempt Credit level examinations, other subjects he described as clear Credit.

Robin's descriptions of classrooms indicated that the atmosphere in the class was important as a condition for him to work well. Observation of him suggested he worked well in class, but when classrooms were too quiet he experienced feelings of paranoia. Robin said, "Yeah. I think I am but ...". I asked, "But inside you ... you feel differently?" Robin said, "Yeah. I'm pretty paranoid, yeah... when it's too quiet you sort of - you notice things, you know you can hear people, you can hear any movement. You know, if you knock somebody - if you knock your book off the desk everybody will start 'oh hear you!', instead of if you knock it off the desk when everybody's talking there won't be as much attention paid to it...". I gently asked, "You used the word 'paranoid', do you actually feel frightened when you're sat there or do you just feel anxious?" Robin said he was sometimes afraid of other boys, "Not as much sort of physical, I can quite handle that." Robin had never been 'sent out of the classroom'.

In contrast to the majority of boys at City School his social relations with girls were very distant and limited to a brief 'sorry' if he was bumped, or in class a pupil might ask 'could you lend me a ruler' if the necessity arose. Robin said, "I don't think really they notice me that much. They don't really pay attention." Robin described some of the ways in which girls socially excluded other girls, and went on to reveal that boys use the same strategies towards other boys. Robin said, "They're like ignored or they're not allowed to work with them, like they'd sit at other tables. I've seen it with boys as well. I mean I've gone to sit down at a table and two of the other boys sitting at that table have moved, sat up, stood up and moved to go across to another table, just because I've come to sit there. I said, "That must feel horrible?" Robin replied, "Yeah. It's not nice, no!" I asked, "What do you think they're doing there? Is that something against you or protecting themselves (...)" Robin interrupted, "Against you ... It's ... some people ... like I said, reputations, sometimes it's not what you do it's sometimes what other people do. Sometimes people do things to get you a reputation. If people beat up you, you'll get a reputation as weak. Em, if people like ignore you or exclude you from their group you get this reputation as having no friends." Robin appears to manage the pain of his experience of social exclusion by focusing upon his school work.

Girls 'not in trouble'

Jean is an S3 girl at Town School and Kim, Ellen and Katy are S3 girls at City School.

Jean is a 'quiet' girl who has difficulty in getting her voice heard except within a small group of 'good' girls. Within the context of her friendship network she is described as a 'chatterbox'. Jean perceives herself as educationally struggling to do well. She described feeling intimidated by some of her male teachers, whom she says shout at pupils in class. Some teachers do not give her a chance to ask questions about school work that she does not understand. Jean has never been 'sent out of the class' and described how some pupils are more demanding than her, "Yes well some people are different and some people just shout out and ask for the teacher. Some people are quiet like me and just sit there and wait for the teacher to do something about ... like it's you that should do something and tell the teacher you're stuck ...but I just wait for the teacher to come." Her participation in the focus group at Town School illustrated what she meant, as she made comparatively less contribution than other pupils, however her comments revealed that she was interested in the procedure. In her interview Jean found expressing her ideas difficult and she clearly needed time to formulate them. Jean's interview was unusual in that it was the only interview that was constantly interrupted, which clearly had a negative impact upon Jean's capacity to make her points clear.

At Town School there is not an obvious 'cool' network identifiable by use of public space, but Jean's described herself as not belonging with the 'in' people, that is, those who are known to fight. Jean sometimes participates as an audience to a 'fight'. Jean described an awareness of a social network of 'bad' girls whom she thinks must be avoided if she is to stay safe. Jean talked about some pupils as engaging in 'fights' in school and outside school with pupils from a nearby High School. An obvious difference between the schools is that Town School is a Roman Catholic state school whilst the other is a non-denominational state school. However, 'fights' were not of a sectarian nature, but more about establishing some kind of social pecking order.

Ellen and Katy arrived for Ellen's interview together, Katy had 'chummed' Ellen! During their interview they referred to fights at City School which were arose between pupils known as City's pupils, and 'Asian boys' from another school. The 'fights' were racialised, but again hearing the account one could also hear action as establishing some social pecking order in the neighbourhood. Ellen perceived herself as socially included in a 'popular' network of girls, not 'popular' in a sexually derogatory sense. But, my observation of Ellen were that she was not quite 'cool' as she was not a regular 'gate person'. She and Katy were very clear about the

significance and centrality of being perceived as socially included, expressed as not wanting to be perceived as a 'sad' person.

Ellen was very keen on doing well at her school work and expected to achieve Standard Grades at Credit level. Ellen described an unusual experience for her of being 'in trouble' with a teacher for 'talking in class'; she had received a detention. Both girls thought the teacher was 'having a bad day' as eight pupils in the class ended up on detention for 'talking in class'. Ellen's detention was described as the teacher's response to her reasonable request to her neighbour in class for a, "... loan of her rubber". Ellen's detention was viewed by herself as a nuisance, like Rory, her trouble was 'not serious'. Her difficulties around rule breaking at school were described as par for the course, inevitable because rules were sometimes not followed by teachers who put their own gloss on a rule. Her sense of self esteem and a capacity to laugh at some of the situations she found herself in appeared to enable her to feel in personal overall control of her social relations in social and formal settings.

Her friend Katy described an official response in times past to her dad who as a pupil had set off a fire alarm bell that suggested Exclusion has taken the place of physical punishment. Katy said, "My dad right, he ... you got caned in those days and him and his friend were going to get caned in front of the whole school right so they hid the cane [both girls chuckled] and they were going to get caned because they set off the fire alarm." At Town and City Schools pupils described as having set off the fire alarm were instantly informally Excluded.

Kim is perceived as a 'cool' girl, by herself and other pupils. Kim is an attractive, charming and articulate young woman who seemed at ease in a number of different social networks. Kim, who had a boyfriend located out of school, appeared able and chooses to socialise with different groups of girls and boys, as friends. Kim enjoyed the scene at the 'school gate'; her response to my observation that some pupils appear to avoid passing the group at the school gate was very telling of how 'inside' she was. Kim said, "Ah haven't actually noticed [loud laugh] I'm too busy gossiping [laughed again]." Lauren and Sarah, both marginal people, noticed how 'out' people were kept 'out' by sarcastic comments from 'inside' people. On reflection Kim said, "I suppose you don't really think about it when you're standing there but people walking past probably don't feel too happy... having to walk past us ... I think it

must be very intimidating (...)" Susie interrupted Kim with a story that illustrated how Pierce 'slagged off' people as they passed.

Kim was not a person who ever was 'sent out' of the classroom by teachers. Kim herself did not think that 'skiving' was a 'good' thing to do either socially or educationally. Kim's participation in school and her capacity to do well at her subjects meant she expected and was expected able to achieve Credit Standard Grade examination results. However, Kim's feelings about school belied the apparent ease with which she related to other people and produced good school work. Kim said, "I haven't liked coming to school for this past year actually ... Everybody... I reckon a lot of people in our year have had a really hard time this year (...) I asked, "With things that are happening outside?" Kim replied, "Outside ... in school ... just cos everybody's changing ... they don't know what they think about different things ... I haven't enjoyed coming to school at AT ALL ... but then again if I hadn't I would have hated just sitting at home so....." . The experience of schooling is thus a contradiction: whilst having to come to school to do school work, which may or may not be a positive and enjoyable aspect, school is also a place to meet and make friends, which may or may not be a positive and enjoyable aspect. Clearly attendance at school opens up a wide potential for pupils to experience different combinations of pleasure and pain.

In summary, schooling as a collective experience within a formal setting necessarily involves actors in a dialectical negotiation of social relations. Pupils accounts suggest that 'belonging' in a range of social worlds at school involves 'being chosen' and 'choosing', suggestive of Honneth's argument about the importance of being given 'due recognition' and of extending 'due recognition' to others as central to a mutually beneficial social interaction (Honneth 1995). Choosing consists in three aspects: a person must attend (schooling is not yet an Internet experience where presence is in text); a person must be willing to join in and finally a person must be accepted within a collective. Conversely 'out' in Becker's sense is an outcome of not being able to act as others do; not being willing to act as others do; and not being able to act in socially approved ways.

S3 pupils across all three categories, 'in serious trouble', 'in some trouble' and 'not in trouble', described encountering problems in interactions with others at school and were aware that others experienced emotional and sometimes physical pain; to a greater or lesser extent. A pupil may act with the intention of preserving 'self' from

having to interact with someone he/she feels afraid of or is not-liked by, through withdrawing self from a classroom or school, but be interpreted by others as rejecting peers at school. A pupil might not like or may feel uncomfortable in a particular subject, or with a subject teacher and so chooses to avoid that class, but be interpreted as rejecting schooling. In both cases, the social and educational outcome of the decision is that the pupil effectively excludes self from learning. Clearly permutations between these various aspects create a significant problems of interpreting actors meanings and intentions.

Data show pupils made choices about how to act at school for personal reasons of safety and comfort, which impacted on their social and formal relations at school. Formal categories of 'attendance', 'behaviour' and 'attainment' do not allow for interactive character of schooling to emerge. The kinds of decisions pupils made in the face of 'having to' interact with people at school reveals the complexity of 'social reality' as contingent, emergent and contradictory (Holmwood 1996).

Implications for membership: three different 'skivers'

Tensions between state and parents emerged with the formalisation of state education as a problem of 'truancy' or alternatively as a 'normal' aspect of social arrangements for education (Paterson 1989). 'Skiving', 'truanting' or 'self exclusion' from school continue as central formal concerns of providers of state education. Pupils who do not attend, effectively challenge the law, undermine a school's authority and in turn undermine their own chances of academic success. Persistent 'skiving' may lead to official Exclusion from social and educational opportunities of a mainstream school. Pupils talk about 'skiving' as an activity which invites official 'trouble' as young people have to go to school.

In both schools, the process of selecting pupils showed i) that being 'in trouble' at school is ambiguous in character as not all teachers find the same pupil 'troublesome', and ii) pupils 'in serious trouble' were not found 'performing' well academically, that is, in relation to Standard Grade examinations, and iii) the kind and degree of support a pupil received appeared to correlate with a professionals perception of his/her academic potential. On the one hand, two pupils described as having an innate academic potential were evidently well supported despite repeated breaking of a legal rule to attend school, and formal requirements have and to attain according to ability, for example, less seriously Richard and more

seriously Ross. On the other, two pupils described as not 'academically able' were described in terms of 'behavioural management' in which Jessie's choice to exclude self was consciously ignored, whilst Adrienne was frequently the subject of a *temporary* Exclusion order applied by senior management. Adrienne was referred to by teachers as a 'troublemaker'.

Data showed that in the preceding three years at secondary school three S3 pupils had consistently 'skived' from school. Although 'skiving' is a activity which consistently links the three following pupils the meanings attributed to similar actions did not result in their reputation having similar derogatory effects. Ross is 'known' as a 'skiver', but his 'skiving' did not result in his social exclusion as other pupils valued his presence. His absence is noted, he is missed because he is a social 'mover and shaker', who is generally 'looked up to' by other pupils. His challenging interactions with some teachers, who *other* pupils had little regard for, marked him out as having a maturity which pupils seemed to respect. By the end of the research period in the school, his case was being officially discussed with a view to trying yet another strategy to prevent his Exclusion.

A second pupil, Rhona, is 'known' by pupils as "one of the Chinese girls" who belongs to an 'out' group. Her social distinctiveness is not expressed negatively, but as a statement of fact. Her presence is a part of the cultural diversity that forms a background for the 'in' group. She is socially included by her 'group' and avoids the 'in' group literally by not entering the school by the main gate. She takes time to walk the long way round to a side gate when the obvious gate to enter by is the main school gate. Her 'skiving' is not noted by pupils and only occasionally commented upon by class teachers. In S3 the school provided support for her by making strenuous efforts to create strategies to ameliorate her educational exclusion and to help her to avoid formal Exclusion by helping her to choose to come to school.

A third pupil, Jessie, is socially excluded by all pupils except her friend Rhona. In addition Jessie is educationally excluded by her strategy for managing the social isolation she experiences in the context of school, which is to simply 'disappear'. As noted above, classroom observations of her social and educational interactions record some of her ways of hiding, for example behind her fringe and by withdrawing from a classroom simply by walking out under cover of classroom

noise. Her class teacher privately expressed to me that she was glad when Jessie 'skived off' because of the intensity of Jessie's emotional needs.

Analysis confirmed that social exclusion and Exclusion does not automatically follow for all pupils known as 'skivers' to suggest that, "An attribute that stigmatises one type of possessor can confirm the usualness of another and therefore is neither creditable nor discreditable as a thing in itself" (Goffman, 1963: 13). Ross, for example was discussed in terms of his 'skiving' by his peers, male *and* female, by his teachers, male *and* female and by the administrative staff. Pupils constantly referred to him as a 'skiver'; sometimes the tone of voice suggested disgust, sometimes as a matter of fact, implying that he was justified in his use of this strategy as a practice to avoid unpleasant encounters with some of his teachers. Three of his female peers described his 'skiving' activity as evidence of his maturity and a 'sexy' kind of power that he used to challenge adults. Among teachers Ross was described in terms of his 'skiving' activity by his guidance teacher and other teachers who informally expressed the belief that Ross 'skives' off school. One male teacher described Ross as, "He's a 'skiver' but he's a nice enough lad." Ross's guidance teacher described him as "he's a really nice boy". Official consequences of a reputation, such as a 'skiver', or social consequences among pupils or teachers, appeared to me mitigated to some extent when a pupil was 'liked' by a lot of people. Ultimately, I gained the distinct impression from teachers *and* pupils that Ross largely didn't care what others thought of him.

'Skiving', 'truanting' or 'self exclusion' from school have been a consistent formal concern of providers of state education as pupils who do not attend effectively challenge the law, undermine a school's authority and in turn undermine their chances of academic success. Persistent 'skiving' may lead to official Exclusion and from social and educational opportunities of a mainstream school. Pupils talk about 'skiving' as an activity which invites official 'trouble' as young people have to go to school. Pupils report the activity of 'skiving' largely in negative terms. On the one hand, 'skiving' is acceptable between pupils to a limited degree as a strategy for avoiding a topic or teacher, that is not liked. On the other, 'skiving' is not considered a good idea because 'skiving' puts one behind in terms of getting school work done, effectively self imposed educational exclusion, which pupils argue is bad on the grounds that this activity jeopardises future employment.

Summary

Analysis of pupils' accounts shows gaining a 'self' and a 'social identity' as a person and as a pupil is an on-going social process, which is acknowledged as having significance for *all* pupils. Pupils' descriptions show the contingent, emergent and contradictory character of social relations as on-going; that a positive experience of schooling is largely an outcome of successful negotiation of everyday relations at school (Strauss 1993). Brief descriptions of participants directly involved in the research shows a significant discourse among pupils relation to inclusion/exclusion at school. Three main patterns of social inclusion/exclusion emerge; 'self' imposed, imposed by 'others' and as 'unintended consequence' of action.

Whilst *all* pupils expected to do 'paid work' they were largely pragmatic in recognising the value of education for their economic future; there were differences in levels of enthusiasm for education between 'less able' pupils and other pupils. Descriptions reveal that doing well at school work does not necessarily correspond with social acceptance and that social acceptance does not necessarily correspond with doing well at school work. Elliot, for example did relatively well at his school work, but his social acceptance was frequently questioned on the grounds that he was 'odd'. Most pupils generally experience social acceptance at school to some degree, whereas a minority of pupils evidently experience social rejection among their peers to an unacceptably painful degree.

Boys and girls 'in serious trouble' clearly experienced significant problems in negotiating day-to-day social relations. Karen's emphatically articulated views brought 'trust' and 'privacy' into focus as necessary conditions for resolving relational problems among social actors at school. It must be stressed that *all pupils*, to some degree, experienced times when he/she had difficulty in keeping a 'public face' at school.

At school connections between social and educational exclusion emerged as complex matters of personal decision making shaped largely by feelings of discomfort derived from non-acceptance by others. Becoming a successful member of any collective entails mutual acceptance among social actors who make up a collective. Because attendance at school is compulsory pupils may be forced to enter formal and social situations that he/she experience as largely negative. The collective character of schooling constrains what relatively little choice pupils have

over what is 'done to them' within that experience. All pupils 'in serious trouble', to some degree, experienced a loss of education because of difficulties in handling social situations with their peers. In the 'short term' social disputes between pupils in class led to a loss of education either because a pupil was 'sent out' or because he/she chose not to attend.

Schooling obliges young people to participate within a key formal context, which necessarily requires negotiation of a socially acceptable 'self' with 'others' at school. Data show social competence is significantly linked to social acceptance. Data show social acceptance among peers is of more immediate significance to pupils, which in turn has negative or positive implications for his/her negotiation of the curriculum with a teacher. Whilst pupils recognised the long term significance of successful outcomes of schooling as examination results, in the short term successful negotiation of everyday relations among peers was consistently reported of greater significance to pupils personal happiness and sense of safety. In the chapters that follow data are presented to show details of social and formal processes at school as mutually constituted processes.

Chapter Five

Reputations

*'The purest treasure mortal times afford is a spotless reputation'*¹⁹²

Introduction

This chapter draws upon pupil data to present informal labels used at school that pupils refer to as 'reputations'. Pupils use of reputations show people are socially constructed in everyday talk at school. The chapter argues that reputations are normative statements of action at school that reflect a collective view of actors at school. Pupils use two kinds of reputations that reflect and connect two 'social worlds'; everyday informal sociation among pupils and the everyday formal sociation between teachers and pupils experienced largely within classrooms or learning/teaching areas. The formal significance of reputations is that teachers frequently heard and participated in reputations by referring to pupils by his/her reputation.

Reputations at school

The sociological significance of reputations at school emerged during my *first* informal encounter with pupils in Town School. Three S3 girls, *who were not research participants*, approached me in the playground the day after letters of invitation were sent to pupils inviting them to participate in the research to ask me if I had come to speak to the " ... 'bad' girls?". This Goffmanesque encounter suggested everyday talk as empirically significant; clearly, the research had already become a topic of discussion among pupils. As a descriptive label a reputation is an *informal* statement of how a person is 'known' in his/her community. The chapter argues reputations have social significance in a relatively closed collectivity; i) they provided knowledge about people framed in moral terms of right (good) and wrong (bad); ii) they worked as a shorthand way of knowing about people at school often qualified or nuanced according to sex; and iii) data show pupils' use of reputations

¹⁹² Quoted in *Richard II*, by William Shakespeare.

impact positively and negatively upon a person's social and educational status at school to reflect his/her social inclusion/exclusion at school.

The social significance of reputations at school is evident in Chapter Four, for example Peter and Phillip both state their desire to achieve a 'good' reputation at school; pupils repeatedly described not minding having a reputation as long as it was a 'good' reputation. Pupils' argued reputations shape social relations at school in positive and negative ways, for example Rory's comment illustrates a view supported by all pupils,

Rory: It can be a 'good' reputation or a 'bad' reputation.

Pupils' qualification of reputations in terms of 'goodness' or 'badness' implies that they are moral statements, to suggest how a 'normal' person 'ought to' act in social relations. Reputations reflect how people are *thought* to act relative to how people *ought* to act at school. A reputation expresses a social view of a pupil or teacher who is known by a particular reputation and is thus treated accordingly.

Robin's spontaneous comment regarding Exclusion illustrated a common view that a negative reputation was difficult to transcend. Robin thought Exclusion led to a pupil gaining a 'bad' reputation that followed him/her to the next school via a school report card, which continued to have a negative effect upon the pupil's chances of being positively included among the majority of pupils and the teachers. In Matthew's case, he was aware his 'bad' reputation had 'followed' him after his Exclusion from a fee paying school.

PP: Susie ... was talking about the difficulty of getting rid of a reputation (...)

Matthew: I know that. (*said with emphasis*)

PP: Tell me about that, what do you mean you know about that?

Matthew: I've got a reputation.

PP: How do you know you've got one?

Matthew: I actually know I have because my guidance teacher said I had.

PP: Where did it come from Matthew?

Matthew: From my old school probably.

As lay social theorists, pupils argue that when someone is assigned a 'bad' reputation by pupils or by teachers the person is often perceived as a 'bad' person. Pupils argued that if a 'bad' person is present within the context of 'trouble' at school he/she is immediately blamed for the 'trouble'. Sometimes blame is unjustly attributed to the person with a 'bad' reputation, thus unfairly reinforcing their 'bad' reputation and increasing the likelihood of a pupil becoming the subject of official concern.

Pupils at Town School described reputations as contributing to the veracity accorded to a person's account in dis/agreements among people. After watching 'how people end up being called 'bad'', a video clip from *West Side Story*, I asked,

PP: Why do you think they are getting into trouble with the police?

Karen: Because they've got reputations with the police.

Importantly, meanings conveyed by reputations *do not necessarily* reflect an actor's own definitions of his/her situation, meanings or intentions. In institutional situations, where one actor has authority over another, establishing an agreed course of action is in effect limited by a person's social credibility. Pupils who 'know' of their own 'bad' reputation necessarily negotiate their everyday presentation of a stigmatised 'self' (Goffman 1963).

Elmer and Reichler argue that reputations can be managed (Elmer and Reicher 1995). Data suggest being assigned a 'good' or 'bad' reputation appears to be largely outwith an individual's direct control. The clearest statement of this point was written down by Karen in her notebook. She wrote,

People who are regarded as troublemakers are generally not given a fair hearing if there is any trouble in the school and if these pupils were anywhere near where the trouble was, then they are automatically blamed, whether rightly or wrongly. I think that teachers are too willing to blame these pupils, just to save time and instead of finding out the facts these pupils are used as scapegoats and are sometimes wrongly punished, usually with a punishment exercise, detention or too often an exclusion. If a person tries to improve their behaviour in school then the teachers mock them by saying that they could never change and their past behaviour is continually dragged up to haunt them.

Karen's analysis echoes earlier comments by social theorists. Burgess, for example refers to W. I. Thomas's famous dictum 'If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences' (1928: 584).¹⁹³ Delamont recalls Merton's idea of the 'self-fulfilling prophecy', to argue, "... but its educational implications were made famous - or rather infamous - by Rosenthal and Jackson (1968)" (1983: 64). Constant reference to a pupil in terms of a reputation prepared the minds of other pupils and teachers to expect a pupil to have attitudes associated with and to act in ways that fitted his/her reputation (Hargreaves 1967). Rosenthal and Jackson refer to Merton¹⁹⁴, whose famous dictum that, 'a state of affairs comes to exist by the very fact of its announcement' is supported by data in this study. Many pupils described encountering social and personal difficulties in effecting a change in others' perceptions of him/her as a pupil with a 'bad' reputation.

Reputations used by young people in the research fell into two main kinds: statements referring to social standing as conceptually distinctive from statements referring to a pupil's formal standing or a teacher's professional capacity at school. Pupils reported reputations applied to pupils are used by teachers and that similar reputations are applied to teachers. Reputations refer to a person's social credibility by drawing upon knowledge of where a person lives, about their family and about their cultural/ethnic background. People gain additional impression of individuals by observing 'who people hang about with'. A second kind of reputation assigned at school refers to formal status and achievements. This kind of a reputation arises on the basis of observations of people in class, for example which Standard Grade classes a person attends, how well he/she does in relation to school work and examinations. As 'social institutions' constructed in day to day circles of conversations among pupils and teachers (Bloor 1997: 32), reputations are normative labels that derive meaning from the social and educational norms to which they refer. Reputations operate as descriptions of action, but data suggest they are understood and used in essentialist terms as a statement of being, particular with respect to gender.

In the context of a school's power and authority, data suggest in practice boundaries between reputations and official labels are blurred. To make the argument clear, a

¹⁹³ Burgess (1984) draws upon W. I. Thomas (1928) *The Child In America*, New York: Knopf.

¹⁹⁴ Rosenthal and Jackson draw heavily upon R.K. Merton (1957: 421 -436) *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.

reputation must be conceptually separated from an official label; a reputation is an *informal* statement, whereas an official label is a *formal* statement, which has official consequences for pupils. Pupils' discussions and arguments about reputations suggest that in discussions with pupils and other teachers, teachers draw upon a pupil's reputation in ways that imply a reputation is a statement of fact (Hargreaves *et al* 1967; Wolpe 1988: 40-41). Observing Peter in class, a teacher's use of his name noticeably contrasted with her lack of knowledge of other pupils' names. Her comments suggested Peter was 'known' to her through his 'bad' reputation.¹⁹⁵ Goffman noted how actors include in their conversation about past interactions, events and people comment on absent actor by reference to the absent person in terms of a reputation (Goffman 1959: 26). Analysis of pupil reputations suggests a social explanation of their social significance in everyday interactions is required and as Goffman argues, "... a language of relationships, not attributes, is really needed" (Goffman 1965: 12). Pupils accounts of reputations reveal 'negotiated order' of schooling as a reputation is created in everyday 'talk' among folk about talk/action. Pupils accounts show their talk is about personal thoughts, feelings about activities at school, about social relations with friends, about schooling and about families, *thus social and formal matters at school are linked in 'talk'*. A significant agency of power at school is everyday talk about people and how people act at school.

Discourses

Pupils accounts of reputations raised an awareness of discursive links between social and formal interactions at school to suggest drawing upon theoretical accounts of discourse to achieve a 'linguistic turn' in accounts of Exclusion (Giddens 1984). Ricoeur introduces the concept of discourse to distinguish between spoken and written language to write,

Discourse is [a] language-event or linguistic usage ... introduced by Ferdinand Saussure and Louis Hjelmslev. The first spoke of language (*langue*) - speech (*parole*), the second of schema - usage. We can also add competence - "performance" in Chomsky's language. It is necessary to draw all the

¹⁹⁵ In Chapter Four, I introduce Peter who had recently arrived at City School after his mother and family had negotiated his transfer from his old school. Peter described how he had not been able to get on with his teachers to the extent that social relations had broken down. In Chapter Seven I describe this particular class in more detail to show how teachers draw upon reputations, as partial knowledge of pupils, to control social dynamics in a class.

epistemological consequences of such a duality, namely that the linguistics of discourse has different rules than does the linguistics of language. [For] the French linguist Emile Beveniste, ... these two linguistics are not constructed upon the same units. This distinction had profound empirical implications ... If the sign (phonological or lexical) is the basic unit of language, the sentence is the basic unit of discourse (Ricoeur 1971: 530- 531).

Four points emerge from this, which roughly summarised suggest i) discourse' unlike 'language', is always realized temporally and in a present, whilst language is virtual and outside of time, ii) unlike language 'discourse' does not lack a subject, it refers back to its speaker, iii) 'discourse' is always about something in a world, finally, iv) it is in 'discourse' that messages are exchanged. "In this sense, discourse alone has not only a world, but ... another person ... to whom it is addressed" (Ricoeur 1971: 531).

Austin (cited in Searle) and Searle developed and advocated the idea of a speech act as 'doing', which extended the notion of speech from description and communication to include a 'speech act' as 'doing', for example Searle says we 'do things with words' (Searle 1995). A speech act is defined as "the social act we accomplish by using ... an utterance in a specific situation" (van Dijk 1988: 26).¹⁹⁶ Drawing on Austin's work Habermas writes,

As is well known, Austin distinguishes *locutionary* [the act of saying and its content], *illocutionary* [what is done by saying] and *perlocutionary* [what is achieved]... the three acts that Austin distinguishes can be characterized in the following catch-phrases: to say *something*, to act *in* saying something, to bring about something *though* acting in saying something (Habermas 1984: 288 -289).

Habermas writes of Austin's speech act as, "... presented as a self-sufficient act which the speaker always performs with a communicative intent, that is, so that a

¹⁹⁶ An important acknowledgement is made here to my friend and colleague, Sveta Klimova, at the Department of Sociology, in the University of Edinburgh, for endless discussions especially in relation to Searle's statement, "Sir, you are standing on my foot" (Searle, 1979). Klimova's argument is "When the speaker says. 'Sir, you are standing on my foot', he assumes that it is totally inappropriate to stand on other people's feet, and that it is quite appropriate to tell the other not to do it when they do. He also assumes that the hearer knows that too". (Unpublished thesis at the Sociology Department at the University of Edinburgh). Klimova argues this insight allows a reader of a 'text' to identify rules of interaction between speakers.

hearer may understand and accept his utterance" (Habermas 1984: 289).¹⁹⁷ Bloor argues, "A performative utterance makes itself true by being uttered" (Bloor 1997: 32, cites Bach 1975). Drawing upon Bloor's use of Austin (1961), pupils' creation and use of reputations exemplify Austin's 'performative utterances' in that they achieve something socially.

In the context of schooling this is a salient argument to note. Action at school is observed by a range of 'audiences' who in everyday talk about action try to make sense of situations as they unfold. Heritage writes, "... that within Garfinkel's viewpoint, the common norms, rather than regulating conduct in pre-defined scenes of action, are instead reflexively constitutive of the activities and unfolding circumstances to which they are applied" (Heritage 1984: 109).¹⁹⁸ An 'audience' of one or two outside a class or significant numbers of people in class, draw upon their observations of actors at school to create reputations that act as messages to others. Reputations are reflexive statements that carry a social view of the person to whom the reputation is assigned. Pupils draw upon knowledge of a pupil's action 'in class' in relation to others where the class are audience to and participants in multiple 'performances' that constitute the classroom social dynamic. On the basis of an 'audience's' interpretation of an actor's tone of voice, facial expressions, and body movements, features conveying what pupils describe as 'attitude', for example in sum these features contribute to an audience's assessment of how a person acted in specific encounters with others. Garfinkel argues we seek to locate order in every scene we are involved in and in so doing we base our account of it by reference to rules or order that we expect to experience in a given situation. Heritage paraphrases Garfinkel,

Central to the business of locating order and organization in a scene are the reflexive processes of documentary method of interpretation. Through these processes, intelligible patterns and their constituent particulars are adjusted one to another (Heritage 1984 :103).

¹⁹⁷ This brief description of 'an ideal speech act' prepares the way for Chapter Six. where I present data about boys and 'fighting' and girls and 'talking', to argue they are gendered forms of 'communicative action'.

¹⁹⁸ Chapter One argued formal categories as non-reflexive categories, for example, 'behavioural difficulties', are unable to account for conditions in which pupils act, the meanings or intentions pupils attribute to their actions, and/or any part played by others.

Drawing upon past knowledge of people involved in everyday scenes, members of audiences create, reinforce and recreate reputations, which act as 'external and constraining' upon social relations at school (Scheff 1988: 395). Theoretically, reputations can be understood as constructed through actors' reflexive assessments of action, which operate positively and/or negatively at different levels of formality. I now present data to illustrate social sources of reputations created and used at school.

Sticks and stones will break my bones and names will also hurt me

Reputations at school emerge from two main social sources of lived experience: 'in school' and 'out of school'. Information from 'outside school' passed on in casual conversation 'in school', about actions of others at school, whilst on their way to school, during the school day and on their way home again. Flows of information created in talk that reflects upon past action observed or 'heard about', draw upon three main social spheres of influence home, community and school; in research on Exclusion focus is largely on the classroom. Pupils in talk at school, construct and assign reputations to other pupils, teachers and a range of ancillary staff such as librarians, administrative staff, janitors and dinner 'people'. All of these actors to a greater or lesser degree, participate in discursive processes where reputations as complex social constructions, are created and assigned. Reputations reflect the range and scope of 'intersubjectivities' that constitute everyday lived experience at school: as a pupil in relation to other pupils and their teachers, as a son or daughter in a family setting or with carers, as a young person in relation to other young people.

Pupils talked about reputations that draw upon 'out of school' details of about a person indicating a range of informal reputations as derived from 'knowledge' about families, often created in association with the geographical area from which the family came. A father, for example was described to me by a senior teacher as a 'nutter', a reputation that was inferred to explain his daughter's 'bad' behaviour. Pupils taunted a boy in reference to his father describing him as a "a 'poof' ... who beats you", whilst another father was described as being a 'drug dealer'. Across both schools among boys other people's mothers were constantly described in deliberately derogatory ways, for example mothers were referred to as 'tarts'. Brothers and sisters were also referred to in terms of derogatory reputations, for

example Karen in Town School described herself as being taunted by other girls, who called her brother a 'psycho'.

In general, the tendency for a stigma to spread from the stigmatised individual to his close connections provides a reason why such relations tend either to be avoided or to be terminated, where existing (Goffman 1963: 43).

Data contain many examples of pupils' negative assessments of their own and other pupils' family members. Goffman's view might go some way to explaining why youngsters' need to distance themselves from family relationships in courting the public significance of 'good' relations with friends at school. A 'good' reputation within their own family, however was significant for times when pupils were 'in trouble' at school. A 'good' reputation with parents and/or siblings could help them cope with the stress and pain of resolving the problem. A 'bad' reputation within the family had the effect of exacerbating tensions, when relations became strained between a pupil and his/her family over problems at school and/or 'out of school' activities.¹⁹⁹

Pupils often referred to ethnicity to distinguish individuals, for example as a 'Chinese girl' in a description that referred to someone whose name was not known, or in relation to a group, as 'Moslem people' or 'Asian boys'. Mahmood, in City School, for example described the importance for him and other Moslem children of behaving well at school to avoid Muslims who lived in his city from gaining a 'bad' reputation. Mahmood a Moslem boy said,

Mahmood: ... I mean my mum and dad, they're pretty strict and they don't really want me to get excluded from school or, I'd be in a lot of trouble, and it would give us a bad reputation ... for all the Muslims in (this city).

For children from minority ethnic backgrounds, Exclusion invited a 'bad' reputation, one that pupils felt must be avoided for personal *and* minority ethnic communal interests.

At City School, pupils in a focus group interview and more explicitly described by Ellen and Katy in their joint interview, referred to others in terms of derogatory

¹⁹⁹ Space prevents a proper consideration of the profound impact of 'outside' relations upon pupils, which, as I argue, are drawn upon in pupils reflexive accounting of what happens to them at school.

reputations associated with particular localities. People from one locality were assigned a reputation that was created out of the first half of the place name and the end of the word Android. This reputation was a socially negative one in that its meaning implied that people from that place were of below average intelligence. It was generally associated with another name 'scaffy'²⁰⁰ that implied people from that place were dirty and lived in poverty.

Katy: ...cos you can call people 'Landdroids' and things like about where they live.

PP: They call people what?

Katy: Landdroids, if they live(....)

Ellen: ...if they live in Landdrock, its like an insult.

PP: Landdroids, like in android only a Landdroid? You're not human...

Ellen: NO, Landdroids... are... you know Landdrock the area... really rough and its supposed to be really 'scaffy' to come from there.

Katy: Its an insult they call you that. You ... no ... because you don't have money.

Potentially, reputations can refer to any aspect of a person's social background and presentation of self at school.

PP: So its about where you live...its about everything really isn't it?

Ellen: Yup. How your hair style is. I was called Christmas Tree for a while because my hair, I got called Elvis because my hair was really short and now I get called Afro because I've got a lot [laughs] of hair.

For pupils with high self-esteem this is not a problem, but for those with low self-esteem a 'bad' reputation can be a source of deep personal distress.

²⁰⁰ The term 'scaffy' literally means scavenger and is most commonly used in lowland Scotland as a colloquial term referring largely to men who emptied rubbish bins. However, pupils references to negative reputations that draw upon impoverished living conditions show the persistence of socio-economic inequality in Scotland and its negative effect upon social acceptance and status of poor children among relatively 'better off' children.

Pupils described schools as having 'good' and 'bad' reputations that reflected in social terms on pupils who attended the school. Pupils described the reputation of a school as deriving largely from its social status, which was reflected in 'kinds of children' and 'patterns of learning' of those who attended the school. The following quote arose in reference to public debate about Tony Blair choosing not to send his children to a local school.

Karen : (...) its the kind of children they're mixing with so that they don't pick up bad habits.

Rory: Like going out after school instead of studying.

Karen: Like badly behaved kids, like there are in school, because you're always going to get them. And they think 'we're no wanting our kids to mix with them'.

According to most pupils, the defining feature of a 'good' school was one that was able to create a well 'disciplined' environment. Pupils argued a 'good' school was defined in terms of positive social relations between pupils and teachers, that is, by an absence of bullying!

Ellen's comment, endorsed by Katy, typically illustrated how pupils across both schools described a fundamental social classification of others at school,

Ellen: If you stood in the playground and you watched things going on you could see (....)

PP: As I have. [laughter]

Ellen: You could see who's 'in' and who's 'out'...

Katy: Yeah, who's 'in' and who's 'out'.

A reputation conveys a fundamental social message about social acceptance of individuals as participants in the relations of schooling. The message is a statement of *inclusion/exclusion*, expressed in terms of either 'in' or 'out'. Pupil social and academic 'performances' measured in terms of outcome as 'in' or 'out' are observed and commented upon by a two main audiences: peers who discuss what they see and hear at school; teachers who discuss what they see and hear with other teachers. The extent to which a person is perceived by an 'audience' as conforming to social or academic norms is implicit in the kind of reputation that is assigned to them. Pupils' descriptions of reputations revealed informal and formal

inclusion/exclusion as linked in everyday relations at school. This insight provided a line of inquiry that resonated throughout the research process to show social inclusion/exclusion at school as a central problem that is linked to academic attainment/achievement.

Informal Kinds of Reputations

At a general level of relations among young people, three particular reputations emerged from data as of central significance in social relations between pupils. Known colloquially as 'cool', 'sad' and 'mad', the meanings implied by 'cool', 'sad' and 'mad' defined the normative parameters of social acceptance/rejection in relations between people at school. Pupils "... establish the means of categorising persons and the complement of attributes felt to be ordinary and natural for members of each of these categories" (Goffman 1963: 11). A 'cool' reputation sets the standards for 'normal' social acceptance. Pupils descriptions of the use of these reputations reflect *experience of social inclusion/exclusion* at school in terms of degrees ranging from acceptance to rejection. A 'sad' pupil's social isolation, for example is obvious because they can be observed as 'not included' in conversations or in group interactions, in contrast to a 'cool' pupil who has the attention and apparent respect of other pupils.

Most boys and girls aspire to a 'normal' reputation and a 'cool' reputation was regarded as *the* positive reputation that carried high social status among *most* pupils. Ross and Anna are typical examples of 'cool' people, the kind of people who can be found at the main school gate at break time, people who chat and laugh and discuss current events. Anna, for example is a socially acceptable girl who possessed attributes that were typically described as associated with a 'cool' reputation.

Kim: A girl called Anna she's um... she's got a good social life ... you know she's REALLY PRETTY, really pretty... looks ... oh she goes out clubbing and everything and got a boyfriend in sixth year... she's got a good social life ... she's REALLY CLEVER, really clever ... she's a really good pal and everything and so... she just seems to have ... like be able to get a good balance of everything (...)

Her friend jokes when she says "... its like she's got everything and (laughs as she says the next bit) I really hate her... nah ... not really." However, her joke illustrates potential tensions in relations among girls who on the one hand recognise a friend's

social and academic ability whilst on the other, see the friend as setting standards of social and academic status that are hard to match. Girls described Anna as having a range of positive attributes and significantly boys treat her with respect.

Girls described Ross as the epitome of social 'cool' as evidenced by the fact that he is perceived by girls to be the yard-stick by which *other* boys measure themselves when they attempt to be 'cool'. Kim in her group interview referred to a boy whom girls thought was not as mature as he perceived himself to be.

Kim: Yeah and he's got short dark hair and he's like that (pulls a face) Oh yeah, cool guys I'm going to be trying to be like Ross McFadden and I'm cool and hard and I wear all the designer gear... and he's like trying to show off... there's other people that just do it ... I dunno it just depends how you do it and who they are and how well you get on with them.

The "little boy", as they referred to him, looked up to Ross. Other boys referred to Ross in tones of respect as someone who makes his own decisions and is not intimidated by adults. The social importance of being seen to be a socially acceptable person is illustrated by a contrasting reputation of being known as 'sad' or a 'saddo'..

Pupils across both schools described common use of the reputation of 'saddo'/'sad'. Pupils in both schools boys and girls described some pupils as a 'sad' person, as a 'saddo' or as Susie said, "... a 'dweeb'". Whilst I wanted to understand why some pupils were labelled as 'sad' and despite a willingness to talk about it, pupils often had considerable difficulty in explaining 'sad'. Feelings of shame characterised communications of this kind; for those applying the label as well as for the persons so labelled. Pupils knew their responses to a person labelled as a 'saddo' exacerbated the personal and social difficulties he/she experienced in making friends. Ellen's comments illustrate this point.

Ellen: She's excluded because she's a pain in the neck.

PP: How do you mean?

Katy: Oh dear, no you wouldn't want to know her(....)

Ellen: Oogh.... She's just...if you have to sit next to her you just cringe, because she sits and talks to ye and ...its just ...

Katy: She sort of comes out with things...she's not horrible...

Ellen: I'm not trying to be... horrible

PP: What do you mean?

Katy: Well when you ...she just sort of suddenly says something and you answer it and you....ochhhhh...

PP: What you mean...give me an example?

Ellen: Like she...I'd NEVER met her in my entire life and she came up to me and she said "Are you going to the cafeteria with me?" and I said "No I can't I've already arranged to go." and I didn't know her at all. and she said "Oh that's okay." and then she went off to lunch with someone else. And like, and then I'll come back and she'll expect me to be her best friend! cos she asked me to go to lunch with her and then she'll sit there and she just annoys you (....)

Katy: She won't speak to you and then she will suddenly come out with something and you'll answer it and then she keeps quiet and

PP: So is she not able to relate socially in a way that feels easy?

Katy: No not at all(....)

Ellen: She's not relaxed at all with us. She's like and now like everybody (....)

PP: Tell me something if she... just imagine you were in her shoes and you were trying to make friends and it didn't work would you be relaxed? How do you think (....)

Ellen: Its not that though...I dunno its sounds like... The way I look at it ...when I look at it just now I think, 'Oh that looks really horrible' (....)

Katy: Yeah.

Ellen: But its when (....)

PP: I don't think you're being horrible I think its really hard to actually describe it (....)

Ellen: Its the fact that ...I think it... she's classed as a pain in the neck, not so much sad, just really annoying.

The above discussion is necessarily lengthy so as to convey the nuanced negativity of the emotional experience of this kind of interaction, for the person labelling and the person labelled as 'sad'. Ellen and Katy's comments convey the notion of degree involved in being thought of as a 'saddo', for example some are called 'annoying', a frequently used qualification of the 'saddo' reputation. Pupils generally perceived a 'saddo' to be a 'bad' reputation to have and one to be avoided if at all possible.

Data reveal many instances of similar social interactions between boys as described below, which illustrates how such a reputation reflects norms of membership of relations between boys. Girls too participate in similar interactions, for example as in the case of Ellen and Katy above who act towards another girl in ways that result in her social exclusion. The social effect of being socially denigrated is demonstrated when such an individual tries to integrate him or herself 'into' a social network. Even if a socially accepted individual wants to challenge the social view of a person with a denigrated reputation, he or she risks being socially excluded by a social group.

The following description illustrates the socially complex relations within a group. At Town School, Rory's discussion provided an illustration that shows a reputation of 'saddo' consists in a number of social attributes thought to be negative. Rory's description of his experience shows how through a process of social denigration, a boy at his school was defined as a 'saddo'

Rory: There's a boy who plays for ma....he doesn't really play for the football team, he trains for the football team. And I mean, he's an a'right boy, but he's no like a person I really muck about with.... I talk to him. But it's really a shame (shame) when you're walking past him and you're in a group and he's like on his own just standing and he'll join your group....and people will say 'what are you doing walking with us?'

PP: mm mm so what is there about him that won't let them?

Rory: I don't knowah, he's....people that....people've got this impression of him as being a 'fat, slow, boring boy' and he's not. He's not really fat, he may look a bit fat,he's fast, he's quite good at football and people were just ... wouldn't give him a bit of a break. Nobody will choose him for doubles, but he's a good player...

PP: Mm mm, what's doubles Rory?

Rory: Like when you 'pick' a partner for the football games against the rest.

The quote illustrates a socially complex set of issues, for example the *public shaming* of this boy by his peers, which reinforces his assigned reputation of 'sad' person by a process of constant social exclusion from participation in a group dynamic of a game. Garfinkel says of shame,

The social affects serve various functions both for the person as well as for the collectivity. A prominent function of shame for the person is that of preserving the ego from further onslaughts by withdrawing entirely its contact with the outside. For the collectivity shame is an "individuator." One experiences shame in his own time (Garfinkel 1956: 421).

Rory's reaching out to the boy is in defiance of the group perception of the boy, which by association risks the reputation being assigned to him. However, being perceived as 'sad' by 'cool' people does not necessarily mean someone labelled as 'sad' experiences total social exclusion. A 'sad' person may well have access to or participate in social interactions of a 'sad' group. The reputation of 'saddo' reflects a quality associated with a person that is potentially a matter of degree, that is constantly negotiated in social interaction between pupils.

Generally pupils wish to avoid the person known as 'sad' and pupils so described are characteristically socially ostracised persons. The social implications of being called a 'saddo' are dire. A second negative reputation, 'mad' is described in relation to a person whose social skills and ways of relating to people are generally thought to be *not* 'normal'. Karen described this as a "... reputation in the school like if ye, just say 'you're mad' or something... ". Associated with it is a feared and stoutly rejected reputation of being perceived as a 'psycho', that is, such a person is known to be subject to bouts of madness.²⁰¹ The person is perceived as not quite 'normal' in psychological terms. A reputation closely associated with a person known as 'mad' or weird is that of 'radge', that is someone who very quickly becomes angry in social

²⁰¹ Some children at school have relational difficulties that are shaped largely by personal problems of a psychological character. The care of such children is properly located in the domain of educational psychologists and social workers. However, assessment of psychological difficulties continues to have a 'chicken and egg' character in situations seeking to find solutions to individual pupils who experience these kinds of difficulties. See, for example Lloyds' edited collection (1992).

interactions, whether among pupils or towards teachers. The sign of the 'radge' is that the person so described 'looses it' or 'blows', that is the person loses their temper in their social interactions. These reputations imply degrees of 'madness', from 'mad' to 'psycho' to 'radge'. These reputations imply that such a person may actually harm or hurt others physically as well as emotionally.

Social exclusion by pupils of the person thought to be a 'saddo' reflects a notion of fixed 'identity', however this view is contradicted by other statements about reputations. Reputations between friends were described as characteristically dynamic and uncertain.

PP: You said yesterday that you've found with friends, reputations are a bit dodgy?

Kim: Oh Aye they change all the time. It just depends on what's happening at each time and how well you're getting on with them and how they're reacting.

When reputations changed it appeared to be largely in terms of a shift towards a 'bad' reputation. Pupils did talk about changes for the better, which suggested that as people grew older they 'matured'.²⁰²

All pupils argue that a 'bad' reputation creates conditions of unfairness and a consequent shaming for the individual concerned. As 'bad' reputations, 'sad' and 'mad' define the limits of social rejection. A 'bad' reputation is largely experienced as 'stigma' which Goffman describes as "...possessing an attribute that makes ... (a person) different from others in the category of persons available for him (sic) to be, and of a less desirable kind - in the extreme, a person who is quite thoroughly bad, or dangerous, or weak" (1963: 12). As Goffman puts it, "By definition, of course, we believe the person with a stigma is not quite human" (1963: 12). Goffman's definition of stigma, recognises the arbitrary character of a stigma, to draw attention to social tensions between a 'discredited' and a 'discreditable' stigma. Chapter Two notes Garfinkel's criticism of Goffman's concept of 'passing', to argue the 'presentation of self' in social relations is a continual process.

²⁰² Chapter Eight critiques normative assumptions inherent in the notion of 'maturation' in reference to teachers understandings of 'pupil maturity'.

Gendering of Reputations

Pupils report a use of reputations that refer to stereotypical ideas of 'masculinity' and 'femininity', which suggest they act as a mechanism for defining social relations among boys, among girls, between boys and girls and between pupils and their teachers. Gendered reputations act as normative statements governing social relations among people at school, for example pupils' use of denigrating reputations reflects the degree to which a person so labelled is *socially included/excluded*.. Pupils made specific links between gender and moral worth by identifying a social norm for boys as potentially 'bad' and a social norm for girls as more likely to be 'good'.

PP: So give me an example of a 'bad' and a 'good'.

Rory: A 'good reputation' is, if you're a good person....a person that's got a 'good' reputation is talking and its mostly a girl with the 'good reputation' ...

Rory's discussion of teachers' treatment of girls 'talk in class' as more leniently in comparison to boys, revealed Rory's opinion that girls are generally thought of as more likely to be a 'good' person than are boys. Importantly, Rory's view suggests that by definition girls *deserve* better treatment than boys (Anderson 1995: xix).

All boys across both schools talked about the daily task of keeping up the appearances of being able to be 'hard' and being able to 'fight'. Phillip in Town School, repeated his point that boys have to be 'hard' that they have no choice. Gary rejects the reputation of 'hard' as a definition of 'normal masculinity' as evidenced by a capacity and willingness to 'fight'.

PP: Have you ever managed to persuade somebody who would want a 'fight' to 'talk instead'?

Gary: Well I've never...not really. Well once ... that situation happened to me and ah just walked away because I thought they were being really, really childish and I thought 'why should I have to put up with your bad attitude'.

The consequences of not getting the balance right for a boy is that he will be perceived as a 'soft' boy (Askew and Ross 1988: 17). Gary had a reputation for being a 'soft' boy. Boys' lived experience is argued as shaped by images of stereotypical 'masculinity', that means a boy must be seen as able and willing to 'fight' if necessary.

Rory: I think that if you choose not to be hard, you choose to get bullied, basically, because if you're being all soft you've got to be able to stick up for yourself cos if you don't, you're just going to get bullied all your life.

A 'good' reputation among boys is generally described by boys as a balance between being perceived by other boys as not too 'hard' and not too 'soft'. Among boys, a reputation of 'fighter' acts as a hedge against being perceived as a 'sap', that is a boy unable to defend himself in the time honoured way of men; Rory graphically described his knowledge of being successful in a fight, "Cos they're down crying and bleeding and you're not."

Girls too must manage a fine line in achieving a reputation that is not too 'hard' or tough or too 'soft' or a 'wee sap'. A girl with a 'hard' reputation, was perceived as having failed to know how a girl should behave; a 'hard' girl reputation was not a good reputation to have in any circumstances. Speaking in a way that suggested she was referring to her own experience, Lillianne asserted that 'hard' girls get "battered" for being 'hard' although it was not evident who had 'battered' her. A girl who is known as a 'fighter' has a 'bad' reputation on the grounds that it is evidence of her not being appropriately feminine. Although less so for boys the reputation of 'fighter' is largely perceived as negative for boys and girls.

In a group interview, the social dynamic between participants helped to bring out the fact that a reputation may be viewed in different ways. Kim, Susie and Lauren described reputations commonly assigned to boys, reputations it transpired that were also used for girls.

Kim: 'Fighting' reputation, 'quiet' reputation.

Susie: Being really 'hard'.....

Lauren: Being either really 'hard' or 'sad'.

Kim: Or , yeah sad??

PP: So to be 'hard' is good (for boys) ?

Lauren: Well? *(hesitantly said as she looked at Kim and then at Susie)*

Kim: In some people's eyes, but?? *(Kim's eyebrow arched, conveying her scepticism of this view)*

Lauren: Aye.

Generally girls were wary of 'hard' boys. Kim was less impressed by a boy with a 'hard' reputation, however the other two girls were impressed by a boy with a 'hard' reputation. Nevertheless, these girls shifted their opinions in front of Kim, who *they* identified as *being* 'cool'. Kim was someone whose point of view was significant in terms of *their* own social acceptance in the 'cool' network. Male 'cool' is generally enhanced by the addition of a 'hard' reputation, while the addition of a 'hard' reputation does not generally enhance female 'cool'.

Kim description of gendered kinds of reputations illustrated how reputations are created in talk characterised as "just talking behind people's backs". Kim said,

Kim: Bitchy reputation, a good reputation um (....)

PP: A 'bitchy' reputation? what does that mean?

Kim: Ah ... we're talking about people who are just I don't know... just talking behind people's backs or just being horrible to people and um ... people getting called 'slappers' and things like that ...

PP: What does 'slapper' mean?

Kim: 'slapper' is 'slags'... [pause]

Susie: Its like [pause] well it depends if someone really meant it, it's probably means you go round loads of guys and things like that ...

PP: Mm mm.

Kim: Well people wouldn't respect the way that you did things so it would be hurtful to you.

Susie: And guys would probably avoid you and then you **WOULD** get a reputation, just a name for being like that ...

Susie's emphasis upon "WOULD get a reputation ..." characterises the negative social affect of socially constructing a girl in terms of a this 'bad' reputation as a gradual process (Lees 1993).

Reflections on 'Gender Order'

General and widespread use of the word 'people' among participants reflected a claim for 'equality of opportunity' as the order of the day. As a small piece of evidence of

increasing sexual equality between boys and girls at school, data showed 'people' could be called stupid, by use of distinctively gendered derogatory labels, 'fanny' or 'dick'. However, general claims to equality were contradicted by evidence of a sexual double standard governing potential sexual relations at school. As reflected in earlier *and* more recent findings, sexuality was normatively described in terms of compulsory heterosexuality (Connell 1993; Lees 1993; Martino 1999). Martino does not use the concept 'reputations', but refers to 'stereotypes', for example 'party animals'. Drawing on Willis (1977) and Connell (1993) Martino writes,

Many boys ... define their masculinity within a set of cultural and social practices which involve a rejection and denigration of what they consider to be feminine attributes of behaviours that often serve as marker of homosexuality in the policing of ascendant form of masculinity (Martino 1999: 244).

Martino describes his pupils' use of stereotypical understandings of sexuality as 'natural' and 'heterosexual' an essentialism reflected in my pupil data. Girls, for example reported a socially acceptable boundary for girls *between* being friends with boys in the general sense of the reputation of 'popular' and becoming labelled as 'popular' in a negative sense that leads to a 'bad' reputation as sexually available to any boy. This observation shows traditional norms of 'femininity' as currently shaping potential sexual relations between girls and boys. A girl risks denigrated labelling as 'promiscuous' if she is perceived as 'popular' in the latter sense in her social relations with boys. This norm is described as 'policed' by girls *and* boys in everyday talk.

Kim expressed a common view among girls at both schools that boys were not similarly judged in relation to having lots of sexual partners.

Kim: It doesn't happen with the guys.

PP: ...presumably it can happen with boys? I mean (....)

Kim and Laura and Susie disagreed very strongly with my point above.

Kim: The guys don't get a name like that ... Naw.

Susie: OH Naw.

Kim: I haven't heard one guy getting slagged off from going round girls.

Laura: Its more like slagging for the way they look not ... what they do.

PP: Right so in terms of boys they don't get called 'slapper' a male version of 'slapper'?

All three girls said NO.

PP: Do you think there are boys who are 'slappers'?

Kim: Yeah.

Laura: Yeah there are but they don't get slagged for it.

PP: They don't get slagged for it?

Kim: No. See right a guy goes round right ... goes to a party ... gets off with quite a few people and um doesn't get a slagging for it but if a girl went around and got off with quite a few people they would get a slagging for it.

Laura: Yeah.

Susie: Because you were like more ... more like impressing their friends like "look how many girls I can pull!"

Laura: Seems like a right um ... sort of um (....)

Kim: macho image?

Laura: Aye an image to them ... like their friends think they're hard because they do that but if its a girl then its a different matter.

Adrienne's comments contradicted the widely held view among girls that boys were not defined negatively if they were known to be sexually interested with a number of girls. Adrienne was asked,

PP: What about the other way round, can you call girls 'poofs' or boys 'slags' ?

Adrienne: You call girls lesbians and you call like girls ... boys probably 'male slags' ...

PP: And do people say those things about boys?

Adrienne: Ahha. People say oh he's a 'male slag'...

Adrienne was the only pupil to refer to the possibility of a sexual relationship between girls, but in her reference to "lesbian" she lowered her voice to a whisper.

Adrienne described sexualised reputations used by boys in relation to other boys, noting that boys commonly referred to other boys as "... he's a 'poof' or he's a 'dick'" as derogatory ways of referring to boys. These reputations for boys echo the sexualised derogatory ways in which girls have been and continue to be described. Drawing upon Goffman, boys continue to have to 'give' and 'give off' the message to other boys that they are not a 'soft' boy or a boy who associates *inappropriately* with girls, that is, takes refuge in girl's society (1959: 14). Discussions about boy's with reputations for being 'soft' or a 'sap' implicitly referred to homosexuality. Boys were in fear of being labelled as "a 'poof'", a form of sexual identity or sexual expression that was generally regarded negatively.

Susie's comments show a reputation as assigned through a process of repetition within joking. Jokes have to be interpreted, a process that reflects a fine line in reading meanings of a joke as a continuum from being a 'bit of fun' to becoming a serious social criticism of action,

Susie: If its just a joke and everyone's slagging someone, at first it might be funny and that and you could have a laugh but then if **people keep on saying** it makes you wonder if they mean it or ... you know?

Girls and boys, label girls as a 'slag'. The social affect of being labelled as a 'slag' or 'slapper' is linked to a personal affect, which is described as a loss of self-confidence, self-respect and self-esteem (Honneth 1995).

Laura: She lacks confidence cos she knows ... like they know **we'd** be speaking about her aye?

Pupils interactions with others are thus assessed among peers in terms of current social mores, which are reflected in the reputations they are assigned. If sexually active, called 'going out with', a girl is expected to keep to one boy. However, a girl who gets a reputation for being sexually active *with more* than one boy will get one of a range of negative sexual reputations; a 'popular' girl, a 'wee tart', a 'common' girl or a 'slapper', which is described in reference to 'slag'.

In sum, *informal* reputations emerge from discussion among pupils about the meanings and intentions of action, which are interpreted with reference to current social norms at school. Pupils descriptions of different kinds of reputations reflect a wide range of perceived social factors that cohere in the creation of a reputation: what a person looks like, how s/he speaks, how s/he dresses, how s/he acts, what

s/he smells like, where s/he comes from, and whom s/he associates with socially, how well or badly s/he works at school, how well or badly s/he attains at school. These characteristics are all potential constituent elements of a reputation.

Ellen: Pupil reputations is of, how many guys you get off with, who you've been out with, who you beat up, who you haven't beat up and they've loud mouthed about you and you've done nothing about it. Ehm, what results you've got, you can be (....)

Kay: A swot.

Ellen: ... a reputation as a 'complete brain', sometimes that can be good or that can be bad. You can get a reputation for the clothes you wear, how you talk, where you live, things like that.

Pupil data shows the many forms of inclusion/exclusion at school, which illustrate the collective basis of "insult and degradation [which] can be seen as violating self-confidence, self-respect, or self-esteem" (Anderson 1995: xix).

Formal Kinds of Reputations

Chapter One identifies three rules governing schooling; to attend to behave and to attain. Chapter Four briefly addressed 'attendance' as linked to 'skiving' and its associated reputation of 'skiver'. Chapter Seven addresses reputations associated with 'behaviour, for example pupils described as 'troublemaker' and/or 'Excluded'. This section considers reputations associated with 'attainment' and their links with 'skiving' to show pupils' use of reputations demonstrates discursive links between *informal* and *formal* social relations at school.

Pupils' ambivalence towards schooling is reflected in the reputation of 'swot'. In City School, Ellen brought up the topic 'swotting',

Ellen: ... a reputation as a "complete brain" ... sometimes that can be good or that can be bad.

In Town School, Jean described tensions that pupils generally feel about having to attain/ achieve academically as putting strains on social relations among pupils.

Jean: If people think you're a swot because ... like you just get all your work and get good marks for it and they just think you go home and revise all the time, and so that's the sort of reputation you get there ... 'the swot'... and then people bully you for that, and then that's how they misbehave by bullying and things.

PP: Well let's think about that then ... all of you are saying that you come to school to learn and if you want to learn why would being a swot be a bad thing?

Jean: I don't know. Well some people like ... they don't like the work, they just come to meet up with their friends and all that. So if you get a good mark and they get a low mark it's probably just because they're jealous so they just call you a 'swot' or think you revise all the time.

PP: So they're defending themselves in some way... ?

Jean: It's just 'cos they're jealous because they wouldn't work as hard probably, they don't think they need to and they don't get as good marks...

In this research, social and educational differentiation among pupils was not articulated quite so sharply as in some famous earlier studies, for example Hargreaves (1967) and Ball (1981).²⁰³ Nevertheless a 'swot' reputation was contrasted with a derogatory reputation 'foundies', which referred to less able pupils who attended Standard Grade foundation level classes. Pupils in these classes were portrayed as having psychological problems, for example a pupil stated, "some of them are 'nut cases'". However, Susie challenged assumptions

²⁰³ Hargreaves (1967) studied basic processes of schooling in an English Secondary Modern School. As a participant observer of boys who were of average and below average ability, the study was intended to throw some light upon 'problem areas' "... some twenty per cent of all Secondary Modern Schools - where social and educational problems loomed most terrifyingly" (1967: ix). Hargreaves' study focused on informal social processes and its effects upon the educative process, finding that streaming pupils according to academic ability, measured by IQ testing, to a large extent shaped social relations in a school (1967: xi). The Newsom Report (Newsom, J., (1963) *Half Our Future*, Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, London, HMSO; See also Burgess, 1983) addressed educational inequalities among 'less academically able pupils, and fed into more general debates leading to the introduction of comprehensive schooling. Ball's later study of comprehensive education focused upon the introduction of 'mixed ability' grouping to find that practices of selection known as banding persisted in having a negative impact upon pupils' experience of schooling (1981). Linking 'banding', as a way of ordering pupils into classes according to academic ability, with identity and experience, Ball describes pupils as gaining an identity on the basis of banding. For example, a positive identity is assigned to a band 1 pupil, as 'able to deliver the goods' academically speaking (1981: 22- 52). Ball calls this process stereotyping and argues that in interactions between teachers and pupils, teachers have more positive expectations of band 1 pupils than band 2 pupils. Ball writes, "... social processes at work here appear to be essentially similar to the processes identified by Lacey (See C. Lacey (1970) *Hightown Grammar*, Manchester: Manchester University Press) and Hargreaves (1967).

about foundation pupils as academically unable arguing that pupils had other reasons for being unable to do school work. Achieving a 'good' reputation for doing well at school work, that is, neither too 'swotty' or too 'foundy' created personal tension among many pupils as they respond to socially differentiated demands placed on them in social relations at school. Pupils emotional prioritisation of *informal* relational demands, experienced in their here and now relations, contrasted with *formal* relational demands, which were considered to be a matters that looked towards the future.

The reputation of 'swot' did not necessarily follow the activity of working well at school and getting good marks. The reputation was often averted by a pupil having other attributes that lead to a more socially positive reputation for example, as 'popular'. This point is well illustrated by Anna whose experiences were typical of the pupil, who seemed to gain kudos from doing what, for other pupils, was a source of negative social status.

The reputation 'swot' was the one reputation that teachers did not use! Pupils perceived teachers to think a 'good' pupil is one who gets their work done. Ellen and Kay, in City School described how they thought teachers talked about the different kinds of reputations pupils gained.

PP: Give me .. describe a reputation ... um ...wait a minute ... if you can get a reputation from a teacher and other pupils and from your close friends what are the descriptions of those reputations.

Ellen: A teacher is they go to another teacher and talk about you and they agree you're good behaved, well behaved in class (....)

Kay: ... or bad behaved.

Ellen: ... always disruptive, can do good work etc.

Reputations of most significance for teachers, which carried explicit notions of 'good' or 'bad' pupils were those that referred to a pupil's school work and identity as a pupil. Lillianne perceived pupils with 'good' reputations to be " ... the teacher's pet". When a pupil has a 'bad' reputation among teachers, pupils believe teachers expect the pupil to reject schooling and the school. Similarly, when a pupil has a 'good' reputation pupils believe teachers are more disposed towards treating that

person leniently. Such pupils are not 'bad' persons, they are perceived of as, " ... just having 'bad' day".

Pupils in both schools talked about 'skiving' a lot. Pupils interpret 'skiving' as a way of avoiding classes, topics or teachers that pupils do not like or find unpleasant for some reason. Discussion in a group interview revealed the process that had led to Susie gaining a reputation as a 'skiver' among her peers.

Susie: Right when you get ...

PP: Get labelled as a truant, and do they get labelled as being a truant?

Kim: For skiving[laughs].....

Susie: Because people, we if you were like down at the gate down there right? and like everyone ... like ... and you just start walking away, and everyone goes "where are you going? and you just go "I'm off see you later, I'm going to my house for a cup of coffee." so, like, if you're always going away, if you've been off for weeks (....)

Laura: Getting a reputation for being a skiver.

Typically being assigned the reputation of 'skiver' turned out to have 'bad' social as well as 'bad' formal and educational consequences as illustrated below by Susie's experience.

A negative academic reputation of 'class comedian' is commonly referred to in Town and City School, but boys were described in these terms not girls. Girls described boys as feeling that they have to impress other boys and do so in a variety of ways, for example by playing the 'funny man'. Phillip from Town School gave a typical description of how and why such a reputation is gained.

Phillip: Well I ken like nearly everybody in third year ... cos like in first and second year I used to like gi folk a laugh and that and be the comedian and that...

Reputations can be understood in two ways: for example a 'comedian' is a social 'identity' and to 'gi folk a laugh' is a social 'role' played by Phillip in Town School. The 'class comedian' is regarded differently, either positively or negatively, according to the perspective of the 'audience'. Goffman writes,

In many close-knit groups and communities there are instances of a member who deviates, whether in deed or in the attributes he possesses, or both, and in consequence comes to play a special role, becoming a symbol of the group

and a performer of certain clownish functions, even while he is denied the respect accorded full-fledged members... (1963: 168).

Pupils assigned this type of reputation experience a social distancing by their peers and, to some degree at least, such a person is not fully socially accepted at school. The jokes may or may not include the teacher. Pupils and teachers may react unfavourably to the 'comedian'; the pupil with this reputation may well get into trouble. If the 'comedian' accepts his reputation, he is obliged to be seen fairly regularly in classrooms as 'being funny' so that he maintains his credibility as 'the comedian'. Phillip gained a reputation as 'the comedian' and described the difficulties he experienced in changing people's perceptions of him, *particularly* with respect to his teachers. Kim and many other pupils commented on a significant distinction between reputations assigned by pupils and those assigned by teachers. Whilst the former can change relatively quickly, pupils argued, a reputation with teachers once acquired tends to be 'fixed' in character, which is easier to live with if it is a positive reputation, but very stressful when it is a 'bad' reputation.

Robin described social reputations as emerging from pupil perceptions of each other, in contrast to formal reputations as constructed by adults,

PP: Do pupils make people's reputations or (...)

Robin: Yes. It depends. Social reputations are normally made by pupils... sort of official reputations like class reports and things like that they'll follow you from class to class, school to school, they come mainly from teachers, parents ... the adults.

Social boundaries between adults and children, especially between pupils and teachers, were secured by a powerful reputation, as a 'grass'. Gaining such a reputation meant sure social death among pupils. Susie, in her focus group interview illustrated how pupils share a sense of a normative social divide between adults and young people,

Susie : Everyone sticks by each other when ... (she looks about quickly at the group to see who was there, hesitated and rephrased what she had to say slightly) Oh well I suppose every one sticks by each other when it comes to the police...

PP : ...With the police! What about with teachers?

Susie: If I was having a fight with Laura in the classroom you'd just say you were mucking about because just say...NOBODY WOULD ... if you GRASS on ANYBODY YOU WOULD GET SUCH a bad REPUTATION!

The consequences of being assigned this reputation were graphically stated,

Laura: you loose all your friends then.

Such an act is perceived to be the ultimate act of disloyalty to one's peers an act which breaks social bonds between pupils. Sociological significance of the reputation 'grass' and the social constraints that it effects, is exemplified *par excellence*, in situations where pupils bully or are bullied.

Teacher Reputations

Pupils generally refer to teachers firstly by name, closely associated by the subject they teach and then by reputation. Analysis of pupils' accounts shows pupils create and use reputations for their teachers, which derive from similar normative referents embedded in pupil reputations. Teacher reputations fall into two broad categories that *compare* with pupil categories; those that refer to the kind of *person* a teacher is closely associated with statements about a teacher's *professional capabilities*. Use of teacher reputations reflect an interconnection between the social and professional aspects of teachers as shaping the characteristics of learning and teaching processes ranging from positive to negative ways.²⁰⁴ Finally, teacher reputations reflect pupils concern with the kinds of relationships they experience with their teachers. Descriptions of pupils' use of reputations reveal potential and actual *relational difficulties* between pupils and teachers in a context of differential access to power. Some teachers have nicknames that convey how pupils locate teachers in terms of current cultural interests, for example a small woman teacher who wore a red pullover was known as "the red dwarf". Pupil use of nicknames suggest they are one way of neutralising differences of social power.

²⁰⁴ See Gow and McPherson (1980) *Tell Them From Me*, which emerged from earlier work in Scotland into the curriculum, in which the views of some economically/socially disadvantaged pupils reflect teachers in negative and positive ways. This text encouraged my decision to research Exclusion from the perspective of pupils in attempting to create a reflexive account of Exclusion from school.

Teachers: 'good', 'bad' and 'indifferent'

Teacher reputations can be summarised from a moral perspective. One measure of a teacher's 'goodness', for example is the degree to which pupils perceive that he/she is generally *able* and willing to create fair conditions for learning and teaching. Pupils' perceptions of a teacher's capacity and willingness to exercise personal and professional power in this way are described in terms of reputations. A 'good' teacher is often described as a person who is friendly and appears to care about his/her pupils, the kind of teacher who is able to relate to pupils, make jokes with them, that is, jokes experienced by pupils as funny! Whilst creating a relaxed and friendly 'atmosphere in class' the 'good' teacher is able and willing to keep 'control' of various social dynamics that create the social conditions in which lessons are taught. Through this double exercise of personal and professional power a 'good' teacher is described by pupils as able to create 'disciplined' social relations among pupils considered necessary for teaching and learning to unfold.

Pupils frequently refer to teachers either negatively or positively, as 'bad' or 'good'. Closer analysis of accounts from which a statement emerges that Mr. Mrs. or Miss is a 'good'/'bad' teacher, suggests the term generally refers to one or more of a range of important qualities that pupils *expect* teachers to possess in order to be able to carry out his or her job well. A 'good' teacher is described by pupils as a person who conveys to them a sense that he/she is professional in the conduct of their formal task; by generally turning up on time, coming to a lesson well prepared, with interesting material appropriate to the educational needs of the pupils in the class. These capacities mirror schools' expectations of pupils that they attend on time, come to lessons prepared to do school work, that is, have a pencil, jotter or gym kit and with their homework completed.

In contrast, a 'bad' teacher is described as one who does not care for the pupils either socially or educationally. A 'bad' teacher is one who turns up late and does not come prepared to teach the class. Such a teacher was described as a 'skiver'! The outcome for pupils in this kind of scenario is the experience of learning is " ... so boring". Associated with the latter, a 'bad' teacher is one who is not able or willing to keep control of the class by *fair* means.

Elliot: ... I know that there's a Spanish teacher, I've never had him but I've heard that he usually 'picks someone out' in the class and generally usually 'psyches them off' a lot. I believe that because I know a person who lived across the road from me in Mossbank and sometimes we use to give her a lift and she's in 5th Year now and she use to get 'slagged off' by him quite a lot and there was a bit of a problem with that. But he seems ... he's still here, I mean he's still teaching here ...

Elliot is one of a number of pupils who spontaneously referred to the Spanish teacher in City School as illustrative of how a few teachers were well known for 'not caring' for their pupils at all. Pupils expect their teachers to make and keep a 'good' *professional boundary*, which does not preclude good relationships between a teacher and pupils. Ellen thought her Chemistry teacher was a 'good' teacher' and spontaneously summed her feelings about her Chemistry teacher saying, "She's your friend."

Teachers are sometimes described as having a reputation for being 'annoying' because they make jokes that are not funny or he/she attempts to be friendly in a way that is experienced by pupils as embarrassing.

Ellen: Yes. If I had problems I would never go to my registration teacher. She just seems like a complete brick wall that you can't... with no emotion or anything its as if she's got a machine gun under the desk when she's talking to you... you kind of just do the formal things like giving your name if you're late she'll put an L on it ... but if she jokes you have to laugh don't you [chuckling and turning to K for affirmation] you know?

PP: Or you'll get shot?

Katy and Ellen laugh and say "Yeah".

Another registration teacher had a reputation for being a 'schitzo', a reputation that echoed the 'mad' reputation assigned to some pupils. However, variations in the reputations pupils assign to the same teacher convey an important fact: that teachers are rarely perceived as wholly 'bad' or wholly 'good'. Data indicate that most pupils recognise that not all teachers have the *necessary combination* of personal and professional qualities that make what in their view is a 'good' teacher.

Ellen: You can't do Mrs M's style with all the subjects I mean its just her personality... I mean ... we couldn't get our English teacher to do that because he's so withdrawn and quiet...he couldn't do that...

Katy: Yeah

Ellen: ... he's so old-fashioned way of teaching ...

PP: What's his style like? Tell me (....)

Ellen: He puts it on the board and you gotta understand it if you don't that's tough [chuckles].

Pupils recognised the fact that it is to be expected that teachers will differ in their style of teaching and capacity to relate to pupils, and that pupils have to take that into account as an aspect of the every day relations of schooling that require a 'bit of give and take'.

Pupils describe how a teacher may experience social acceptance or rejection by a class which is expressed in the collective use of a reputation pupils create and use when referring to their class teacher, for example the 'smelly teacher'. Elliot's comments indicates the depth of negative response that pupils can feel towards a teacher on account of personal qualities,

Elliot: Mr Banks, the Maths teacher, he was rather round, big-boned and he just smells so bad and he dresses in these big shirts that kind of you can see the buttons are popping and like his trousers sag behind his bottom and he just makes everyone cringe. And then he bends over you to show you what to do and you get this kind of smell of BO and it's horrible. We saw him today and he's kind of got these kind of see-through translucent trousers and you can see that he tucked the small bit of his tie you know the short bit that you get, he tucks it across and it kind of works its way up, it was like lying flat across his chest. There's absolutely no reason why that would make you feel like to want to cringe or something but he does ...

However, pupils talk about the necessity of having and showing respect for teachers as a necessary condition for 'good' teaching and learning relationships.

Gary: " ... Ah always treat teachers with respect ..."
 Gary went on to say, " ... even though they probably have a bad reputation like for being soft (...)"

Pupils describe teachers with reputations for being 'soft' as experiencing negative treatment, for example Gary talked about teachers with reputations as 'soft' as being 'bullied' by pupils!²⁰⁵

A teacher's gender is not of general concern among pupils, however at the level of reputations boys in this research used reputations that referred to the sexuality of female teachers. Elliot, for example described one teacher as 'tarty' and Rory talked at length about his Geography teacher who 'smelled good' to him and other boys. Girls also described their feelings in relation to some male teachers, for example the 'sad' teacher above treats girls in a way that makes them feel uncomfortable; he has a reputation among girls as 'sleazy'. Elliot described an example of gendered unfairness,

Elliot: Well I know that Miss Powell lets girls out of the class first and things and generally she gives boys harder punishments than girls.

In-depth descriptions of events at school indicate some pupils consider that gender differentially influence interactions between teachers and pupils which shape the outcome of those interactions in positive and negative ways.²⁰⁶

In sum, in discussions with each other about their individual experiences with teachers, pupils assign teachers with reputations that connote a range of personal qualities, for example as being 'friendly', as being 'fair' or 'unfair', as being 'too soft', as being 'too loud' and as being 'strict'. Pupils stated expectation was that fairness of treatment should characterise formal relations at school. Elliot's reference to his Spanish teacher's unkindly and unprofessional treatment of pupils draws attention to power differentials between teachers and pupils. Pupils draw a distinction between 'respecting' a teacher's professional abilities and 'liking' him/her as a person. The former feeling is necessary to create conditions for learning and teaching, whilst the latter feeling is not always present in formal relations between pupils and teacher.

²⁰⁵ A reader is reminded that Gary's own experiences of being bullied by other boys at school and his reported suicide attempt.

²⁰⁶ This topic will be discussed more directly in Chapter Six.

The problem of securing fair and equal treatment in social relations at school is best exemplified by the person assigned a 'sad' reputation. Honneth writes, "To the extent to which every member of a society is in a position to esteem himself or herself, one can speak of a state of social solidarity" (Honneth 1995: 129). Rory, Emma and Katy's views reflect a concern for the social exclusion of the person labelled as 'sad' or put another way they raise a normative claim for social relations at school; to be as they ought to be. The 'sad' or 'quiet' pupil experiences social exclusion on the grounds of being 'known' as socially incompetent for some reason or other. As a form of 'trouble' it manifests itself in sociation among people, which generally impacts negatively in formal relations at school. Robin's experiences illustrate how pupils generally do not want to be known as or be seen associating with a 'sad' person.²⁰⁷ Teachers and pupils are thus faced with a socially recognised difficulties in finding ways to relating to a pupil in conditions of his/her non-recognition. Teachers can suggest a 'sad' person be socially accepted, however they cannot 'make it happen' for the pupil with a 'sad' reputation, which creates problems for class teachers and guidance staff. Because of the social boundaries between staff and pupils, staff must find ways to support a 'sad' pupil that are not too obvious to other pupils.

Pupils are sometimes taught by a teacher who, for whatever reason, pupils experience as 'sad' or 'bad' or even 'mad' as discussed above. In conditions which require pupils to 'behave' according to formal codes that assume teachers' personal and professional competence a teacher's lack of social recognition poses significant problems for pupils. An imbalance of formal power between pupils and teachers clearly creates difficult tensions for pupils in their negotiation of social relations with such a teacher. This point highlights the contingency of social relations at school and a potential for contradictions within everyday negotiation of learning and teaching.

Variable meanings of reputations

Analysis of empirical creation and use of reputations points towards sociological theory's 'linguistic turn' from 'individual' to 'subjectivity' and ultimately 'intersubjectivity' (Giddens 1976). The socially constructed aspect of reputations draw

²⁰⁷ See Chapter Four in which Robin describes his treatment by other pupils in classrooms as creating his feelings of 'paranoia'.

upon socially recognised meanings. Among pupils, for example having a reputation for being a 'swot' is generally thought to reflect an actor's acceptance of schooling, in contrast to having a reputation for being a 'skiver', which is generally thought to reflect a rejection of schooling. Whilst pupils recognise the descriptive meaning of a reputation, in practice reputations convey different messages to different people. Honneth draws upon Hegel's 'struggle for recognition' and Mead's 'naturalistic pragmatism' to argue identity formation depends crucially on the development of self-confidence, self-respect and self-esteem, which he calls a 'relation to self' (Honneth 1995: 92- 130). Honneth argues that 'relation to self' is constituted within social relations, "... acquired and maintained intersubjectively through being granted recognition by others whom one also recognises" (Anderson 1995: xi). In the day to day struggle for recognition at school reputations reflect a person's social recognition expressed as 'bad' or 'good' or qualified in terms of degree.

The reputations of 'swot' and 'skiver' are assigned to people observed or perceived to engage in the activities of 'swotting' and 'skiving'. Reputations operate on a number of levels of social significance; among friends, amongst other pupils, among teachers, within a family and even within a wider community. In theory and in practice, an individual can be assigned a reputation from within any one of these social milieu thus reputations reflect the range of sociation and its discursive character. Use of reputations at school can be described as comment upon action or as a statement of a person as having a 'fixed identity', a person is a 'skiver'. The latter definition according to Honneth is the area of normative demands internal to the relationship of mutual recognition (Honneth 1995). The personal significance one attributes to a reputation depends upon who assigns the reputation. Anderson writes, "As Hegel showed recognition is worthless if it does not come from someone whom one views as deserving recognition" (Anderson 1995: xviii). A reputation refers to action, but its meaning derives from the context in which it is used, partly from the perspective of those *who* assign a reputation and partly from feelings that the person *to whom* the reputation is assigned evokes in those that assign the reputation. Value connotations associated with any one reputation are conveyed by the tone of voice used by the speaker, thus the meanings of reputations are complex and appear to operate on a number of levels of meaning. The juxtaposition, for example of an apparently 'discredited' reputation with a tone of voice that suggests a positive regard or value of the person to whom the reputation refers, reveals a complex dynamic social process.

Ultimately the process unfolds over time from an observation of actors as 'doing', which has a potential for actors becoming defined as 'being'.

In the context of a small group interview, Susie's reflections on her experiences of 'skiving' illustrate social processes from informal labelling for 'skiving' to official label of 'truant'.

PP: I want you to try to think hard what you've talked about is what it *feels like* to be a 'truant', if such a think exists, what I want you to try and think about is how do you officially get a label as a 'truant'.

Susie: What by the school?

PP: Yes. How does that happen? Do you know how it happens?

Susie: ... its just like ... you do it once and they catch you and you go, right that's fine, right they ... don't go ... oh, right that's fine, but they go ... make sure you don't do that again blah blah and they keep their eye on you and then if you do it again then it starts become a common occurrence type thing and then if you do it again and again and then they just go next time you're off they just go, well she's probably, let's say I was ill in my bed they go, of she's probably skiving cos she's been doing it so much. And that's how you get the reputation!

PP: And what do they then do with that person that now has the reputation as s skiver?

Kim: Attendance Sheet.

Susie's 'short term' decisions to 'skive' from school in favour of her 'outside' relations had a negative effect upon her 'inside' school relations.

Kim: It was like ... right I'm off see youse later ... because we were associated with the school so it was like you didn't want to come and speak to any of us ... and that was it, you know new friends good-bye, you know what I mean?

Susie listened to Kim's description of how people at school felt about her 'skiving' and made a noise that sounded like recognition of what Kim and others had felt at the time. Later in the interview, Susie interrupted to state very clearly she had not intended to reject her friends at school, but had wanted to avoid being confined at school and obligated to do school work that she "hated". A negative cumulative effect of absence

from a class upon school work, whether self imposed or officially imposed, is well illustrated by Susie's decisions to 'skive'; she fell behind in her school work and lost her impetus to try to 'fill in' the teaching/learning she had missed.

Pupils who choose to 'skive' thus experience negative effects upon social and educational experience as reflected in his/her reputation within the collective: informal and formal relations at school emerge as mutually constituted in everyday talk. Once applied to a person any of the reputations I have described suggests a degree of exclusion/inclusion as reputations imply a sense of 'belonging' or not 'belonging' as the case may be among informal and formal relations of school. The level at which a reputation operates is significant to the extent it is 'known' among different 'publics'.

Summary

One aim of this thesis is to shift psychological and economic perspectives, which tend to individualise 'trouble' at school to include a sociological perspective. As lay social theorists, pupils' accounts of reputations at school suggest their centrality to understanding processes of exclusion as throughout the research process pupils continually referred to others in terms of reputations. Pupils descriptions of the meaning and use of reputations show them to be normative statements that refer to social and educational norms, which pupils qualify in moral terms as 'good' or 'bad'. Pupils use similar reputations to refer to a teacher's personal status and/or professional attributes and capabilities.

Analytically pupil reputations refer to two separate social orders or 'social worlds' at school in which informal relations among pupils and formal relations among teachers and their classes are mutually constituted in everyday life. Reputations can be classified according to these 'social worlds'. Some reputations corresponded with social norms, for example social acceptance/'cool' or loyalty to friends/'sound' as nuanced in stereotypically gendered ways. Some reputations corresponded with *formal* rules governing schooling, for example attendance/'skiver' or attainment/'swot'. Significantly pupils' descriptions of reputations strongly imply that a reputation has the status of 'knowledge' about the person to whom a reputation is assigned, which is relevant in the context that teachers 'know' pupils by their social reputations. Social construction of actors at school in terms of a reputation creates a social expectation that actors will act in accordance with whatever reputation the collective assigns.

Often derogatory in character, reputations created and used at school draw upon the information about where a person lives about their family/cultural background. Where a person comes from or is perceived to come from emerges as a significant source of 'good' or 'bad' social status. Some reputations clearly draw upon classist views, which were often embedded in references to their own school's reputation as compared with other schools' reputations. Pupils generally did not openly express racist views nor was racism evident in pupils' use of reputations. Pupils clearly categorised actors at school according to social and cultural differences.

Despite pupils' claims that people at school be treated as socially equal, reputations show essentialist understandings of gender and a persistence of sexual double standards. Pupils used derogatory sexualised reputations which distinguished between boys and girls. Girls were referred to as 'a wee tart' and a 'slapper' whilst boys were referred to as a 'poof'. A reputation as 'popular' can be a high status reputation assigned to boys and girls, which does not exclude the possibility of a friendship with a member of the *opposite* sex that has a sexual dimension. When applied to a girl the 'popular' reputation can gain two meanings another illustration of the way in which a reputation can gain different meanings depending upon the tone of voice of the speaker and the precise social activity which is associated with the reputation.

More reputations refer to social attributes or characteristics than to reputations that refer to academic/professional ability. The range and scope of informal reputations used among pupils reflects the significance of social relations at school. Having a 'good' informal reputation is of greater personal and social importance among pupils than having a 'good' academic reputation. The social significance of being labelled negatively, for example as 'mad', 'bad' or 'sad', is that by definition the person is perceived of as not 'normal' and arguably, in one form or another, leads to a pupil's experience of social and/or educational exclusion.²⁰⁸ Pupils argue the assignment of a 'bad' reputation at school generally has negative social effects at the level of informal

²⁰⁸ Exclusion in this case refers to a practice used by teachers, which involves separating a pupil from his/her peers during a lesson. It may involve a pupil moving to another desk to sit alone or actually involve 'time out from class'. This latter practice of exclusion means that a pupil is not able to participate in the learning and teaching experienced by the rest of the class. See Munnet *al.* (2000: 73 - 74), who discuss these practices as 'internal exclusion'.

and formal relations. Pupils' descriptions of the reputation of 'sad' suggest a person so 'known' is seriously socially excluded. The links between social and formal significance of reputations at school are shown by drawing upon speech act theories, which argue 'we do things with words'.

Three main points emerge so far about pupils' views of their experience of school and schooling. First, that informal relations among pupils are argued by them to be of greater significance in everyday experience of schooling. Informal relations are of immediate personal and social concern to pupils, whereas formal relations are largely perceived as focusing upon aspirations for the future (Wexler 1992: 10). Second, that pupils draw attention to the social significance of reputations created and used among pupils. Reputations, as reflections of a collective's view of a person, effectively socially construct individuals in terms of a reputation. Third, whilst pupils talked about 'good' reputations, they most frequently talked about negative effects of having a 'bad' reputation upon their own and others' social and educational experience. Importantly, it is 'others' as a social audience who label or assign one or more reputations to an individual, for example as 'soft', 'hard' or 'sound'. Pupils' descriptions illustrate reputations generally convey *notions of degree*, that is, the degree to which the person to whom the reputation is assigned, is a) judged by the 'society' (of the school) to accept or reject the rules/norms to which the reputation refers, and/or b) the degree to which the person is accepted or rejected by that 'society'. In the case of a 'bad' reputation, effecting a change in people's perception of a person is a very hard change to bring about. Chapter Six describes social interaction from which reputations emerge. Chapter Seven continues with the theme of reputations to present and discuss data that illustrates empirical connections between informal reputations and Official labels.

Chapter Six

Informal Relations at school

pals enemies and 'saddos'?

Introduction

This chapter examines pupils' accounts of similarities and differences in their experience of 'gender relations' at school (Connell 1987; Finch 1993). This chapter begins an examination of pupils' 'discursive practices' conceptualised as 'gendered gerunds', which is continued in Chapter Seven to present an account of pupils negotiation of 'school relations'. Despite pupils' stated expectations of gender equality, data show essentialist ideas are drawn upon by social audiences at school to interpret actors meanings in interactions at school, for example the chapter shows how boys' actions at school are defined reflexively during discussions among boys. A pupil's quest for 'self' as a person and as a pupil is worked out during mutually constitutive processes of informal and formal relations at school.

Social audiences and networks

At City School 'normality' for many young people is defined in reference to a mixed sex social network known as 'cool' people, whose breaktime gatherings outside the main school gate effectively 'colonised time' (Giddens 1995). My attention was drawn to this place by spirals of pale grey cigarette smoke that drifted into the air above the heads of boys and girls. This area clearly had general social significance. The smoke came to symbolise the marking of a spatial boundary between *informality* and *formality* at school. It was a place in which to see and be seen on a daily basis. Goffman discusses the role of 'deference' in relations between social actors as taking many forms; one broad grouping is termed,

...presentational rituals , ... that encompass acts through which the individual makes specific attestations to recipients concerning how he regards them and how he will treat them in the on-going interactions... presentational rituals specify what is to be done... (Goffman 1956: 47 85).

'Gate' pupils perceived themselves and wanted to be perceived as 'cool' people; that was partly why they congregated in this place. At the gate some key actors had the

effect of extending or withholding a promise of social acceptance (Goffman 1967 [1955]).

PP: ... some people didn't even come in through the gate they went some other way. So ... it's like that group had a power over that space?

Susie: Sort of Yeah like when ... the people are walking past that aren't so popular they 'lipped' a wee bit don't you think?

Kim: Ah haven't actually noticed [loud laugh] I'm too busy gossiping [laughed again].

Susie: Like once I said hi to Rab and that and ehm ... canna mind who it was ... I think it was Pierce or something, he goes, "Cloud bucket ... [the tone of voice implied sarcasm and the words were not clear]. He went like that and it's such a shame ... I thought it's such a shame.

Kim: I suppose you don't really think about it when you're standing there but people walking past probably don't feel too happy ... having to walk past us (....)

Susie: I think it must be very intimidation (....)

PP: Oh some people actually went the other way ... you know came up the street and went down the street to cross and came back in. But that doesn't happen to you? You feel quite happy to walk through that group?

Lauren: [nods in agreement].

Kim: Ah ha.

Susie: Cos they're all our pals.

Participation in the 'chat' among pupils 'at the gate' publicly indicated whether a person was generally accepted as 'cool'.

Pupils emphasised a central social requirement that pupils must be seen as 'fitting in' evidenced by acceptance in a social network at school. Pupils described their 'social worlds' as defined by a specific interest that drew individuals together, observable partly by their shared style of dress and demeanour. Whilst 'gate' people at City School were argued to be social trend-setters, pupils provided examples of many other mixed sex and single sex groupings. Town School pupils used the term 'cool' people, but the geography of the school did not lend itself to a distinctive

gathering of 'cool' people. Jean, at Town School described a group of girls as the 'hard girls' (Hey 1997: 31 -52), her tone of voice conveyed her view of this group as generally thought of as an 'out' group. Jean argued that if a girl or boy wanted to stay out of 'trouble' these girls must be avoided. Social relocation was not a matter of personal choice, for example Phillip a boy associated with 'harder' boys, emphasised its exclusionary effect on his attempts to make new social connections. In City School boys and girls referred to the 'macho men' as an 'out' group of boys. Boys emphasised that association with 'harder boys' lead to getting into 'trouble' and a 'bad' reputation.

Acknowledged and potential 'cool' people perceived many pupils who do not 'belong' in their group as 'sad' people (Carlen 1992). In day-to-day organisation and arrangement of social activities a 'sad' person may be excluded in terms of access to social arrangements between 'cool' people, but may be included in what is perceived as an 'out' group.

Katy: You can be called SAD if they (the 'popular' group) exclude you (....)

Ellen: But, you're not really excluded if you're called SAD because there's a group of people who are really SAD but they don't ... they can get excluded from their group ...

Katy: Yeah...

Ellen: But, they are excluded from our group do you know what I mean?

PP: There's an in-group and an out-group!?

Katy: Because its their group of friends and the other people 'popular' people call them

Mahmood and Jessie were among a few pupils who considered *exclusion a positive outcome of interaction* as they were able to rest from the stresses of keeping 'face'.

Pupil's reputations derived partly from being perceived as associated with a particular 'social world' and in turn a 'social world's reputation derived partly from perceived similarities among those colloquially described by pupils as "hanging about together". 'Out' or 'sad' groups were defined in contrast to 'in' or 'popular' groups indicating 'social worlds' as more or less socially valued. Pupils describe being simultaneously associated with a number of groups to some degree, for

example Ellen and Katy described Susie as 'borderline cool'. Association with and/or participation in one group does not necessarily 'fix' an individual 'in' that context. Sociation among pupils was reported by them as continuous, to a greater or lesser extent, throughout the school day. Although fluid in character, groups are perceived to be constituted hierarchically reflecting the negotiated character of social inclusion/exclusion within and between social groupings.

Pupils across both schools consistently use the gender neutral term 'people' when talking generally about specific events at school. I often had to inquire of pupils what was the gender of the person being discussed, which suggests a degree of shift from the public sexism of Willis' 'lads' (1977). Whilst gender was clearly salient youngsters across both schools stressed a general moral principle that "fairness" *ought to* characterise social relations among "... people at school". However pupils provided many examples of unfair practice, for example, relations among people were said to be greatly influenced by a social perception that some people are not liked (Crossley 1998).²⁰⁹ Socially unacceptable people were argued to evoke negative feelings in others sometimes of a visceral kind, which caused others to want to avoid or exclude such a person socially. Sometimes these feelings were fleeting and/or were not generally held, but some people were generally not liked. Some people were liked, but came to be perceived as in some way as changed and altered.

Gender and 'sticking up for yourself'

In specific contexts of 'sociality' gender is made more or less salient and infused with particular meanings (Connell 1987). Thorne draws upon Goffman's notion of 'with-then-apart' rituals and forms of social organisation and conflict (Goffman 1977: 317), to argue whilst sex segregation is empirically sustained as a characteristic of 'gender relations' at school it is far from total. Among the 'gate people' I observed examples of 'with then apart' rituals, where girls and boys were observed kissing each other, and then turning to talk in same sex pairs (Goffman

²⁰⁹ Crossley's account builds upon Habermas, who is nevertheless taken to task for, " ... failing to give sufficient attention to the affective dimension of communicative action. Habermas fails to consider that communication is (or at least can be) more than an exchange of symbols and ideas; that it is a process of mutual affecting in which interlocutors make emotional as well as cognitive appeal" (1998: 16 -17).

1959; Thorne 1995). 'Gender relations' emerge as a variable complicated process.

Thorne writes,

To gain an understanding of gender which can encompass both the 'with' and the 'apart' of sex segregation, analysis should start not with the individual, nor with a search for sex differences, but, with social relationships... Gender should be conceptualised as a system of relationships rather than as an immutable and dichotomous given (Thorne 1994 : 117).

A sex difference approach has masked the possibility that gender arrangements as patterns of similarity *and* difference may vary and by social situation, social class, ethnicity and region (MacIntosh 1990). Thorne suggests when? and how? kind of questions as more appropriate questions to ask of gender formations, when and how does gender enter into group formation?

Pupils' reported that 'sticking up for yourself' as a necessary condition of giving or keeping face in 'school relations' particularly among actors at school (Goffman 1959). Pupils described a spectrum of 'hardness' to 'softness' against which they measured 'self' and 'others'; 'normal' people relative to this qualitative spectrum were neither too 'hard' or too 'soft'. These social norms were noted in pupils' accounts of dis/agreements among them, for example a 'normal' person is, " ... able to stand up for yourself". Heritage writes,

Within [Garfinkel's] viewpoint, the common norms, rather than regulating conduct in pre-defined scenes of action, *are instead reflexively constitutive of the activities and unfolding circumstances to which they are applied* (1984: 109).

Adrienne's point that in social relations at school, "Aye you have to stick up for yourself...", was generally commented upon as pupils thought of this norm as a necessary social capacity a person must develop to indicate a good 'self' esteem, which was said to inspire the respect of others.

Appropriate 'sticking up for yourself' emerged as stereotypically differentiated by gender. Defined in terms of being perceived to be located somewhere along a continuum of 'hardness' to 'softness', pupils **stereotypically** equated 'normal masculinity' in contrast to 'softness' as defining 'normal femininity'. Lillianne argued for example, "Boys are harder than girls, anyway, supposed to be ... people say...". Young people describe 'normality' in terms of degree to which a boy or girl is perceived as conforming with to gendered norms. Boys are expected to 'stand up for self' in way that is not 'too hard' and not 'too soft'; the former leads to his being perceived as aggressive, '*bad*' or '*mad*', whilst the latter leads to a boys being

percieved as 'soft' or at its most extreme as 'sad'. This defining process measures girls according to the same spectrum, she is expected to 'stand up for self', but girls are rarely perceived of as 'too soft', although some are referred to as 'sad'. Girls are also perceived of as '*mad*' or '*bad*'. Importantly, boys are more likely to be called 'bad' than 'mad', whereas the reverse case for girls.

Phillip frequently reiterated the social convention for boys, "You have to be 'hard'." Whereas boys clearly state a defining feature of a 'normal' boy is 'hardness', for girls no clear defining statement emerges about what constitutes a 'normal' girl. Definitions of 'normality' for girls are more likely to be stated in negative terms relative to boys, for example Lillianne said, "... aye boys are ... like... hard and you're a wee sap ... *that's what folk think*". Lillianne specifically states at other points that a teacher has told her she must act in a "...ladylike" manner. Acceptance as a positive outcome of gendered socation in a 'negotiated order' at school evidently required continual 'social work' *within* and *across* social and educational collectivities as constitutive of everyday experience of schooling. Social acceptance of individuals by people perceived as major players in an 'in crowd' contributed to individual positive self esteem and social well being.

Social identity

Pupils described the formation of their sense of 'self' as young persons in interactions such as these. Drawing upon Erikson's notion of 'basic trust' as embodied, Honneth argues formation of an autonomous identity depends upon development of self-confidence, self-respect and self-esteem, which as a relation to self is "acquired and maintained intersubjectively through being granted recognition by others whom one also recognises" (Honneth 1995: xi). Mahmood from City School, linked himself explicitly in terms 'self' as having an 'inner' and 'outer' core, which linked him to others in interaction,

Mahmood: The very first thing you need in this school is a good appearance, good clothes, a good make, like Nike, Adidas and all that. You've seen that stuff ... And also the things that you do, the way you talk and the way you walk and all that.

PP: Do you mean things that you do like hobbies?

Mahmood: Not the hobbies ...

PP: But just the way you present yourself?

Mahmood: Yeah. your **outer core** as I call it. Like you have to come in wearing a pair of Levi jeans or if they're Nike trainers or something like that, or Kickers, whatever, and a decent shirt out of Ralph Lauren or Terry Smith, a jumper or something like that.

Mahmood's comments about the social significance of meanings imputed to styles of dress were echoed by other pupils. How one looked was said to create a first impression of who one may be 'inside'. McCrone cites Hall to argue identity, "... is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside representation (McCrone 1998: 29). Hall's references are salient in exploring pupils' accounts about relations at school where pupils describe the implications of having a socially acceptable 'identity' as largely determining whether one is perceived as an 'in' person or an 'out' person (Becker 1963).

Presentation of 'self' at school: as 'performative action'

Goffman's 'dramaturgical' analysis of people's experience of having stigmatised identities, indicates the management of 'self' is an on-going project of re/creation of a socially acceptable 'identity' (Goffman 1963). Chapter Four argued being known as someone's brother or sister or child, for example plays a part in why people may choose to associate with each other, but pupils argue that during initial encounters at school a pupil's *appearance* is of social significance as youngsters are known initially or even primarily by how they look. On the basis of another's appearance people report variously feeling repelled, attracted or simply not noticed in the context of mass schooling. Goffman cites Ichheiser (1959: 14) when he describes how, "... the individual will have to act so that (s/he) intentionally or unintentionally *expresses* (him/her self) and the others will in turn have to be *impressed* in some way by (him/her)." Goffman defines two kinds of radically different *expression* : what a person *gives* and what a person *gives off*. The first concept involves traditional communication in the narrow sense of using language to convey information that is commonly understood to be associated with the words used. As Goffman puts it, the second concept involves action that "... others can treat as symptomatic of the actor, the expectation being that the action was performed for reasons other than the information conveyed in this way" (1959: 14). On what basis do 'audiences' interpret actors meanings and intentions? Goffman's formulation of action, illustrated by a pupils' use of 'sad' or 'cool' reputations, points towards social complexity of negotiated relations at school.

Pupils' accounts suggest their perspective on the social world begins with 'self' then turns towards others. Individuals are defined in terms of degree to which he/she 'fits in' with current socially constructed images of 'normality' as Karen's startling analytical clarity shows,

Boys and girls are now wearing the same clothes i.e., girls and boys wear trousers, girls and boys wear the same sweatshirts, *girls wear boys trainers and shoes.* (my italics) (Karen, Town School).

Whilst pupils described essential social characteristics commonly thought to ensure social acceptance by others, for example a girl or boy must be perceived as socially competent and likeable. As positive personal attributes that allow a person to fit in or "to blend in" youngsters had to wear the 'right clothes'.

Mahmood: Sort of like - for instance there's loads of people that get good clothes, they can't really get slagged, a lot of good friends, they get on well with everyone. I mean it's just, you know, like rich and all that and everyone keeps slagging me because I've got bad things on and all that.

PP: Slow down a little bit. What you're saying, the first thing you need when you come to school is good clothes and a good appearance. Right. Because that's the sort of things that people can slag you for

Mahmood: Yes ...

PP: Is this just for boys?

Mahmood: And girls.

Mahmood described people in normative terms; he wanted to be perceived as 'normal' so that he would avoid being 'slagged' by other boys.

Boys are commonly compared with girls as *thinking* and *reacting* differently to 'annoying' or 'challenging' situations. Karen writes,

I think the only differences between boys and girls are:

- the way boys and girls wear their hair
- the different deodorants that boys and girls use
- their tempers
- different jewellery

- their mentalities (Karen, Town School).

In 1998, Karen's descriptions suggest a persistence of stereotyping male and female action in reference to essentialist ideas of 'femininity' and 'masculinity' (Sharpe 1994 [1976]: 63 -90). Her ideas resonated in pupils' accounts, which show pupils compare each other in terms of voice, face, body smell, style of hair, decoration of bodies and styles of clothing. Sociation among pupils created 'audiences' who observe and report upon the 'performance' of 'others' at school, according to gender norms. Different kinds of reputations are constructed within these discussions. Pupils are known in terms of the reputation assigned during such discussions.

Gender and appearance

Although, style and 'presentation of self' applies equally to boys and girls, boys relative to girls have *limited repertoires* of socially approved ways of presenting themselves. Karen's comment, "... *girls wear boys trainers and shoes.*", is a telling indication of how a degree of similarity in terms of unisex clothing can mask subtle differences between boys and girls, but reverse gender borrowing does not operate; boys cannot wear skirts.²¹⁰ Girls emerge as having a *wider repertoire* of socially approved ways of presenting 'self'. "For young women in contemporary society ... not only are a wide range of options available to them in terms of their self-definition, but that an active negotiation of positions which are potentially intersecting and contradictory is necessary (Budgeon 1997: 1). In both schools, girls *and* boys clearly worried about how they looked, what they wore, how they interacted as these matters contributed to how well he/she is socially assessed.

Girls' accounts indicate social approval of girls by boys and among girls are stated in the same general terms of 'cool' and 'sad'. Girls continue to be measured by their looks and how they dress and how they conduct themselves in relation to other girls and to boys (Lees 1993; Sharpe 1994). As Ellen and Katy's example of their friend, Sarah, a girl they liked and respected, shows,

²¹⁰ In Scotland the kilt is increasingly worn in less conventional ways, for example, men and boys are frequently seen wearing the kilt with a rugby shirt, which arguably sustains the wearer's male credentials as conventionally understood. You don't see boys at school in a navy-blue pleated skirt.

Ellen: ... She's really shy and she worries about what everyone else thinks constantly and she does her make-up all the time in case somebody can slag her about the way she looks... doesn't she? [to Katy]

Ellen's perception of Sarah's concerns about her appearance was understood as Sarah not wanting to be different from how 'normal' girls are expected to look. Ellen's descriptions reflected a persistence of norms of stereotypical 'femininity' that girls look good at all times.

Ellen: She's really pretty and she's always really neatly dressed and her face is always well done up and recently she's had like allergy and hay fever in her eyes and when she walks past some people and some people are talking to her she covers her eyes so that they can't see it (....)

Sarah's responses to not looking at her best, contrast with a boy who was happy to draw attention to his sore, runny eyes. He used it as an excuse to stop doing his school work.

Boys' accounts showed 'normal' boys are defined in terms of general appearance as compared with boys of average height and weight for a particular age.

Mahmood: Tom's normal, sort of like - I mean he's average height, average weight, average size, blah, blah ...

Boys talk about body size and development as contributing to notions of social acceptance; they want to be perceived as more or less the same as other boys of their age.

Material evidence, for example unisex garments and shoes show gendered differences in rules of interaction as blurred. Subtle differences are applied to how girls are defined as to some degree girls are able to 'borrow' some of the ways in which boys dress such as wearing trousers, whereas boys do not wear dresses or skirts. Despite a ubiquitous wearing of Doc Marten's boots by boys and girls, subtle social differences continue to be marked between boys and girls, for example pupils distinguished sport shoes along gender lines. Adrienne established that "... you get girls one's and boys one's." Rory pointed to Adrienne's shoes and said "that's ... they are girls Reeboks". Boys would not willingly wear sports shoes that are perceived of as girls sports shoes whereas girls are prepared to cross that divide. I asked, "How

do you know if they are girls one's?" Adrienne said, "Because boys wouldn't wear them". The difference is so subtle that despite buying a pair of Reeboks from a 'boys stand', Rory described feeling uncertain about the fact that they were boys shoes as he has seen girls wearing the very same colour and design. Budgeon argues differential access to material resources reflect the fact that "... young women do not constitute a homogeneous group" (Budgeon 1997: 2).

Goffman's 'dramaturgical' perspective helped analyse pupils' reportage of a daily 'presentation of self', which they perceive in terms of a social impression (Goffman 1959: 1). Appearance has social effect within a collective as access to material resources contributes towards pupils' capacity to present a socially acceptable 'self'. Youngsters partially construct a social 'identity' through organising, as Ellen and Katy in City School said, "... the things that you do, the way you talk and the way you walk and all that", in other words to organise the presentation of everyday self (Jamieson 1997: 94 -99). In terms of appearance girls draw upon a wider repertoire of socially acceptable dress. Rigid adherence to traditional definitions of gender difference emerge as relatively more socially significant for boys, largely in terms of physical safety.

Levels of 'knowing' at school

Social relations among pupils and teachers are reported as differentiated by different degrees of 'knowing' among people that pupils describe as ranging from, friends as people with whom one can, as Emma said, "'be who they truly are", to pals who as Kim and Phillip suggested are of a more instrumental character, to people who, as Karen and others argue are thought of as dangerous and not to be trusted. Pupils hope for a 'good' friend, but everyday life at school is dynamic; as Phillip said, people 'all fall oot' with each other. Pupils argue that to keep safe at school, pupils need to be accepted among different social groupings. Pupils firmly distinguished between 'people' in general and people at school who are considered to be friends. Paul described a friend as someone whom he knows and who knows him.

Paul: He wasn't my friend I didn't ken him.

Pupils differentiate relations at school in terms of, a) friendship as 'private' relations between boys and between girls, in which youngsters spend time together out of personal choice; b)'public' relations between youngsters organised largely in relation to academic ability; c) relations experienced as stressful and sometimes

frightening. Kim and Paul described having 'short term' and 'instrumental' pals, people who meet due to the school's allocation of pupils to classes according to their level of academic ability in a subject

Most pupils stated their expectation of experiencing friendship as a positive outcome of attendance at school. Silver writes, "Friendship is one means by which persons establish trust between them" (Silver 1989: 275). The defining feature of friendship as distinct from other social relations among pupils is 'trust'. Pupils define a friend in terms of loyalty, which among pupils at school is differentiated according to the closeness of 'knowing' between people. Friendship at school is described as 'hanging about together' with people "ye ken" and like and in terms of degree as long and short term. Jean voiced a commonly held view across both schools that boys *and* girls experienced general worries about relational problems between pupils, "it is the same ... it is just the same". Pupils' claim of others as friends or not friends, conveys a notion of social inclusion. The effects of perceiving 'self', or of being perceived by others as having an unacceptable social identity, limits access to 'normal' friendship networks at school and the informal social resources and opportunities that flow from them.

Pupils describe relationships with people they have been 'pals' with since primary school. S1 to S3 years are described as bringing about many changes in friendships; pupils report experiencing conflicts of loyalty and/or feelings of pain and rejection. Durkheim argues, "... in a group formed of numerous and varied elements, new combinations are always being produced" (Durkheim 1984: 26). A deep sense of 'knowing' such people develops through those changes. S3 boys *and* girls often referred to having a 'best friend' and often the 'best friend' had been known since primary school. In such interactions trust is achieved and mutually recognised (Honneth 1995). Pupils described a valued benefit of having friends at school as an opportunity to gain a sense of personal self esteem. Pupils described their expectations that pupils should show loyalty to family siblings/cousins, loyalty to pupils who shared similar cultural groupings and loyalty to their own teacher. The breaking of a confidence or failing to be loyal to one's friends effected great distress at school.

Pupils described a range of friendship, one -to- one, triads and larger social groupings. Evoking Durkheim, who writes, "... social networks ... come into play [for] material, neighbourhood, solidarity of interests, the need of uniting against a common danger, or simply to unite, [all] are powerful causes of relationship"

(Durkheim 1984:18), in a focus group, pupils argued that friendship at school was important in terms of 'self' protection. This following discussion was prompted by a reported death of a young girl by an alleged 'gang' of girls.

Susie: See that's why your pals jump in for ye. Ye never go anywhere without your pals. We'd never go anywhere on our own. We always go with at least two people. And there are always people that you meet, and you make as may friends as you can ... Its not like just that you want loads of friends and that but it means (...)

Kim: So that if you get into trouble then you'll know that you've got people that'll stand by you.

Friendship was described as a relation of trust and co-operation between actors characterised by mutual respect, free from fear of ridicule and/or physical assault, in which participants can expect mutual loyalty in times of trouble. In addition to companionship, pleasure and support friends, albeit differentiated by gender, were argued to provide protection in times of trouble.

Goffman's analysis did not allow for a reflexive account of pupils' negotiations of everyday norms, or an interpretation of the rational basis of action (Heritage 1984). Authors use new labels, which in effect reify the problem of 'gender relations', for example, 'cool guys', 'swots' and 'wimps' and 'shorties, low-lifers, hardnuts and kings' (Prendergast and Forrest 1998; Connell 1993). Hearn argues that sociology's attempts to conceptualise 'discursive' and 'material' practices they become sexualised as masculine (Hearn 1996: 214). Connell specifically calls for an avoidance of reifying social experience (Connell 1987). Categories such as 'social identity' or 'masculinity' and 'femininity' had a reifying effect upon my attempts to present pupil data as they did not allow for the discursive character of pupils accounts to come through.

Informal relations at school: as 'communicative action'

Analysis of pupils' arguments showed a usage of actor's categories or 'discursive practices', which linked pupils in gendered ways. Analysis of pupils' accounts of

schooling revealed seven main categories of 'communicative action'.²¹¹ Habermas writes,

Insofar as we master the means for the construction of an ideal speech situation, we can conceive the ideas of truth, freedom and justice - which interpret each other - only as ideas of course. For on the strength of communicative competence we can by no means really produce the ideal to which we belong; we can only anticipate this situation (Habermas 1970: 143-144).

Habermas argues interaction is normatively ordered as we check out the validity of our claims in everyday speech acts (Habermas 1987: 113 - 190). For Habermas all speech acts are oriented to communication and are criticisable on the basis of the extent to which actors can reach agreement. In so far as a 'speech act' fails to achieve communication, which Habermas would call 'distorted communication', actors nevertheless seek to establish the validity of claims which constitute interaction. Habermas identifies three aspects of a speech act, which form the normative basis of criticism of a claim as well as the analytical frame in which a claim is assessed. Rationality for Habermas is discursively produced in interaction as actors try to reach agreement. Habermas argues everyday 'speech acts' largely emerge as 'distorted' communications between actors.²¹² Habermas' concept of 'communicative action' is socially complex as he argues analyses of 'speech acts' shows how actors, through their validity claims, are linked to the production and reproduction of 'person', 'society' and 'culture' (Habermas 1987). Conceptualised as 'communicative action', actors' categories of action allowed data to be analysed and presented as reflecting processes of normative labelling within social collectivities at school.

²¹¹ Habermas defines 'communicative action' as action that is oriented to reaching rational agreement (Habermas 1987: 113-190). Habermas writes, "Communicative action relies on a co-operative process of interpretation in which participants relate simultaneously to something in the objective, the social, and the subjective worlds, even when they *thematically stress only one* of the three components in their utterances. Speaker and hearer use the reference system of the three worlds as an interpretive framework within which they work out their common situation definitions. They do not relate point-blank to something in a world but relativize their utterances against the chance that their validity will be contested by another actor."

²¹² Habermas does not consider gender as a problem in modernity; his explanation for gendered inequalities would be explained by reference to his concept of 'distorted communication'.

Pupils in both schools referred to 'discursive practices' or 'speech acts' used by pupils in 'getting to know' people and in 'resolving problems between people', for example 'talking', 'fighting', 'slagging', 'stirring', 'radging', 'grassing' and 'moaning'.²¹³ Drawing upon Searle's idea of 'a speech act' as 'doing', which extends the notion of speech from description and communication to include the statement, we 'do things with words', the form of action which links pupils is speech, for example 'fighting' is reported as emerging from verbal dis/agreement of some kind. Considered from a 'gerund' perspective, 'fighting' is an example of a noun formed from a verb ending in 'ing' that denotes an action or state, which implicitly refers to different ways of communicating. Pupils' accounts of schooling can be linked to official accounts of in/discipline through the concept of 'fighting'. Central to pupils 'categories of action', which I call 'gendered gerunds',²¹⁴ are references to 'talking' and 'fighting' as ways of negotiating everyday rules of interaction among boys, among girls and across the gender divide at school.²¹⁵ Data show 'talking' and 'fighting' are used to describe gendered forms of 'communicative action' among young people, although in practice boys and girls use 'talking' as ways of communicating within same sex relations, and mixed-sex relations, whilst 'fighting' was conducted within same sex relations.

- definition of 'talking'

Analysis of individual interviews and focus group interviews revealed a distinctive notion of 'talking' among pupils, which emerged as a way of resolving disputes among them. This kind of 'talk' was distinctive in the sense that 'talk' was reflexive in character, in contrast with 'talk' that entailed simply passing on information. Girls described 'talking' with other girls and boys described 'talking' with other boys, but

²¹³ This chapter explores most pupil categories with examples drawn from the data. The category of 'grassing', which largely defines boundaries of communications between youngsters and adults, is introduced. Chapter Seven explores the remaining pupil categories, for example, 'grassing' and 'moaning' in its presentation of data that illustrates pupils negotiation of formal relations at school.

²¹⁴ The reason for calling the gerunds gendered, particularly in relation to 'talking' and 'fighting', is made clear later in the chapter as their meanings emerges in the context of data presentation. In this section I wish to make the argument clear and so do not clutter it with examples for the moment.

²¹⁵ In modernity, Habermas argues gender is not theoretically relevant to 'communicative action', a point that this thesis would reject as evidently not the case in practice.

pupils observed that some girls and some boys did not get involved in 'talking'. Karen made a strong gender link with 'talking' as she described girls approach to resolving disputes between girls as 'talking it through' in contrast to boys whom she described as resolving disputes among boys as 'fighting it out'. Other pupils confirmed her gendered ideas and considered 'talking it through' to be the best way of resolving disputes. Gary noted 'talking it through' was a time consuming process.

- definition of 'fighting'

Among pupils 'fighting' is a common occurrence, that is, making aggressive physical contact with another with the intention to hurt, which pupils qualified in terms of 'not serious' to 'really serious' (Benyon 1989). Many boys describe 'fighting' as a way of establishing a social identity and friendships among boys. Evidence of a 'normal' degree of 'hardness' in boys is measured by a boy's perceived capacity and willingness to 'fight' with other boys. Pupils observed that many pupils did not get involved in actual 'fighting' as fighters, but were often drawn into participating in 'fighting' as audiences. Boys commented that boys or girls who 'fight' are stupid and people known as 'fighters' are to be avoided if at all possible. Boys were more strongly associated with 'fighting' as boys and girls perceived some boys to be persistent in coercing other boys into 'fighting it out' as a way of resolving disputes. In three accounts of separate 'serious fights', for example girls and boys described being hurt by boys.²¹⁶ Discussions about 'talking' and 'fighting' provided many examples of the unfolding character of micro social processes at school.

²¹⁶ It is not possible to offer accounts of actual fights reported by pupils because of the theoretical focus of the thesis and word limits placed upon it. It is important to note however, fights can be summarised as arising out of social differences. Town School fights can be differentiated from City School fights. Within Town School, participants in fights were differentiated largely by locality, whilst fights with pupils from other local schools were characterised as religious differences between other local schools. At City School, fights were reported between minority ethnic pupils and indigenous Scots. Fights were also reported by City School pupils between City School Asian boys and other local school Asian boys. The similarities between explanations for fights suggested that they were intended to establish boundaries to use of space and issues of social status. Pupils in both schools reported their concerns that fights were becoming racialised. In Town School this took the form of local youngsters against a chip shop owned by an Asian family.

Boys fighting/ talking

Definitions of 'normal' maleness emerged from discussions among boys about 'fighting'. Boys raised the notion of rules or social norms as governing how 'fighting' ought to be conducted (Martino 1999). Rory argued that if boys did fight "... they must fight fairly without weapons." Phillip understood Rory's reference to rules as written down and argued "But there's nae rules in fighting though." Rory re-asserted rules as a normative view "... there's no rules, but there ... its just like the way it should be done." Data show boys largely define 'self' and 'other' boys in terms of having a capacity and willingness to fight with other boys. Boys are described as more likely than girls to engage in 'fighting', which is perceived stereotypically as a 'natural' and largely socially approved interaction.

Boys described 'normal' relations among them in terms of a high level of physical contact, characterised as 'mucking about', as wanting to keep conflict between self and other boys within acceptable degrees of physical contact, that is, 'pushing and shoving', without getting into a full blown set piece 'fight'. Rory explained that boys have to fight to establish and maintain a respected social identity in relations between boys "Its about like ... wanting to be the hardest ... showing them that they shouldnae boss you about."

Pupils described individual boys as hierarchically differentiated according to a perceived status *within* a group. This position was commonly contested among boys.

Mahmood: Well to tell you the truth you know how if I get annoyed I usually turn really 'mental'.

PP: Do you? What do you mean? You shout?

Mahmood: It's like I get a bit wide.²¹⁷

PP: Wide?

²¹⁷ The use of the term 'wide' is commonly understood as getting above one's social status, which implies social hierarchy in terms of social value, but, in this instance the term could be understood as referring to a racist agenda.

Mahmood: It's like if someone hits me a bit harder than me they could batter me if I wanted a fight and I hit them back and they go 'Are you getting white? Come on then' and stuff like that.

PP: Are you saying 'wide' or 'white'?

Mahmood: White, wide, we call it the same thing.

PP: What does it mean, I don't understand it...

Mahmood: It's like, for instance you're harder than me and you just came up to me for a laugh, for no reason, and you just punched me in the shoulder for no reason and give me a dead arm, then I start saying blah, blah, blah, F Off, whatever and then you 'WHAT did you say!?' and all that, and then you know you're getting wider, and then suddenly I swear back at him and he starts swearing and then he punches me again, then I hit out. I sort of like shield myself and sort of swearing back at him. He's like 'You're so wide,' because I'm getting back at him even though I can't really have him or anything like that ... Being cheeky, that's what it is ... It's like getting cheeky towards another person your same age ...

PP: Who is more powerful than you?

Mahmood: Yeah. Not a teacher but pupils.

Mahmood's spontaneous differentiation of relations among boys, all generally defined as 'cool' people, in terms of 'high' status, 'middle' status and 'low' status are suggestive of a nascent 'hegemonic masculinity' (Carrigan *et al* 1985).²¹⁸ Mahmood's account exemplifies a number of accounts that could have been analysed through 'class' and 'ethnicity' (Arshad 1992: 63).²¹⁹ Boys described social status among boys as constantly contested, as a social hierarchy within which boys often challenged others boys. In extending a challenge to and winning a 'fight', a 'harder' boy reinforces 'self' and social

²¹⁸ See Chapter Two, which discusses this concept noting author's definition of 'hegemonic masculinity' as a 'public' relation among males, not as a 'thing-in-itself'.

²¹⁹ Arshad notes, "We may all be 'victims' and also 'victimisers'... [as part of the] problem yet we are part of the solution" to solving acts of discrimination at school (1992: 63). In the wake of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry, the Scottish Executive has published, 'An Action Plan for Scotland', as part of official attempts to address institutional racism in Scottish schools (Executive 1999: 22 - 25).

perceptions of him as 'hard'. Success in 'fighting' secures a boys place in a male 'social world'.

Dis/agreements among boys were largely expected to be resolved through 'fighting' rather than 'talking', although some boys themselves challenged this idea. Robin thought the idea, "... old fashioned", stating boys do talk to each and do not "... fight all the time". Some boys want to resolve arguments through 'talking it through', but feel compelled to comply to demands to 'fight' precisely because boys monitor relations among them. To be seen and discussed as resisting a demand to 'fight' often leads to boys gaining a reputation for being 'soft'. Gary strongly rejected social conventions that boys must 'fight' as a way of relating to each other. Many boys described 'talking' as the best way of allowing problems to be viewed from a number of perspectives. Gary thought that 'talking' was preferable to 'fighting' as you could "... get your feelings out ... you can get both sides of the story." Gary elaborated his point by describing how he thought that some boys, "... the 'harder' boys" were unable to 'talk' and resorted to 'fighting' as a way of settling disagreements, which had an outcome of reinforcing social status.

Gary: ... But if they want to fight with you and you like... I don't know, 'I don't want to 'fight', why don't we just 'talk' about this', and (they say) 'No, no, I want a 'fight' with you.' I don't think they're able to 'talk' to other males or females. I think that's why they 'fight', mair.

PP: So fighting's like a way of talking only

Gary:Yeah

PP: ... in a physical direct way?

Gary: I don't think they 'talk' very much. I don't know, it's just because they're male and they think, eh... if I talk it might implement that I'm 'soft' and I don't want to 'fight'.

Gary's experiences exemplify how boys who want to 'talk' as a means of resolving interpersonal conflicts become labelled as 'soft'. His attempts to talk with other boys about being 'bullied' were an embarrassment for all concerned.

Boys pointed out a contradiction, on the one hand, 'talking' is advocated as a more effective form of settling dis/agreements than 'fighting'. On the other, Gary suggested a 'fight' was a more decisive form of settling dis/agreements.

Gary: Yeah. If the person who wins the fight ... I don't think it would be brung up again

PP: So there's something kind of decisive about it?

Gary: Yeah

Gary characterised male 'fighting' as a decisive event, and female 'talking' as a long drawn out affair.

Karen's arguments that among pupils reaching agreement is done in gendered ways, that is, boys 'fight it out' whilst girls 'talk it through' were confirmed by other pupils. As above in relation to 'talking', in practice boys and girls fight, whilst boys described 'fighting' with other boys, *boys and girls described girls 'fighting' with other girls.*

Boys on girls as 'natural' communicators

Girls were more strongly associated with 'talking' than boys, girls perceived girls *as initiating conversations with boys*, whilst boys and girls thought that 'talking' was a 'natural' aspect of girls. Girls concurred with these views to describe girls as initiating conversations with boys and/or girls, which boys get drawn into. Boys described verbal and physical contacts among girls as less noisy and socially threatening in comparison to boys. Some boys were not interested in girls at all and described girls in disparaging ways that implied girls were 'other' social beings. Their 'talk' about hair cuts, clothes and their worry about how they look is denigrated as socially unimportant.

Girls were not expected to be passive in the traditional sense, but certainly girls were expected to act in socially competent and dignified ways, expressed most strongly in terms of how girls **must not be perceived**. Girls must not be thought of as 'hard'. Boys reported 'normal' girls ought not to 'fight' as that is "unladylike". Girls are expected to be, "... not sad or quiet, but not fighting, slagging, swearing and spitting". General social expectations of girls interactions are characterised in terms of 'talking' rather than 'fighting'; a 'hard' girl does not conform with normative understandings of gender.

Girls fighting/talking

Nevertheless, girls acknowledged 'fighting' among girls. Some adults consider 'fighting' within limits as an okay way for boys to sort out their dis/agreements, a view

challenged by Lillianne in a focus group interview. Lillianne said, "... people say there is no need for girls to fight," and posed a normative question " ... why should boys fight then?" According to a logic of equality of opportunity, girls claim that the repertoire of 'fighting' as a way of resolving dis/agreements be extended to **include** girls. No one suggested that 'fighting' across the gender line was acceptable.

Girls defined their relationships in terms of 'talking' about relationships generally at school. Girls and boys describe girls as more likely than boys to initiate interactions through 'smiles' and 'talking'. Girls are described as expressing friendship with girls through small acts of intimacy; girls 'do' each others hair and hug and kiss each other as they walk along in pairs and triads. Relations with other girls are deeply valued as a mutual experience of emotional and physical support. Girls did not explicitly describe a social hierarchy in relations among girls in the way that boys did; relationships among girls waxed and waned, which became evident when they thought back to their friends from primary school. Girls describe friendship between boys and girls as possible, although there is a strong expectation that a girls 'best' friend is another girl (Stanworth1981; Hey 1997).

Girls vary in their perceptions of what girls talk about with boys. Jean thought that what boys and girls talk about "... is the same". Adrienne thought that 'talking' was not a gendered matter because in her experience some boys and girls talked seriously about relations and life, whilst other boys and girls do not. Lillianne talks to boys about, "... life" and how their lives have unfolded in comparison to hers. Lillianne's topics of conversation among girls are about how she looks and does her make up and her hair. Among girls the boundaries of 'normal' femininity were carefully defined by what girls think of each other, and, by what they *think* boys think of them.

Girls on boys as 'natural' performers

Girls perceive social relations among boys in terms of 'performance' rather than as 'communication'. Lees specifically names boys as 'baddies' in girls educational experiences (Lees 1993). Girls argue that boys think exaggerated male performances impress other boys, which girls perceive as evidence of boys immaturity relative to girls of their own age.

Ellen: He's got black hair and he likes to ... loud mouth off a lot ... but he just ... its not like... its just like smart ... and its not like ... comments ... snarly or anything ... its like primary two style comments ... like you know?

Katy: ... and he gets into trouble because he is not very mature (...)

PP: He gets into trouble for his comments?

Ellen: Its not really that he's trying to show off to us ... its [unintelligible] its to the boys. And he's trying to show that he's hard (...)

Katy agreed with Ellen's perception that boys want to impress other boys, and do so by expressing themselves through an 'over the top' use of their voices and bodies.

Girls in both schools described boys as generally noisier than girls as they move about the school. Susie notes that some boys are more noticeable than others, for example Lauren, Susie and Kim all agreed that 'outside the gate' the characteristics of boys interactions were a source of social comment.

Susie: Its more the 'popular boys' that make the noise.

Kim: Some of the quiet ones are really nice actually, and they're nice when you're ... sitting down and talking to them, but its just like (...)

Lauren: Some of them are dead shy (...)

Kim: Yeah.

Lauren: They don't wanna talk cos they feel like ... I dunno maybe they feel like they're targeted at because like we're above them sort of thing do you know what I mean?

PP: Who? girls are?

Lauren: Well like ... maybe ... like I dunno ... because most of the (...)

Kim: ... quite a lot of the people that are in our English class are in the group of friends that all muck about like outside the gate.

Lauren: ... I suppose everybody sees them as popular because they all stand outside there.

Girls perceived boys as generally less socially competent than girls. Whereas girls perceive boys as impressing other boys, Rory's stereotypical view that girls "like their man to be hard", reflects a reflects potential for misunderstanding in 'gender relations', whereas other boys describe girls as prepared to befriend and support 'soft' boys.

Lillianne commented, "... boys have got their own mind", which reflected a common view that boys' distinctive primary social agenda lies with their relations with other boys. All the boys described feeling a social pressure **to be seen** as sufficiently 'hard' to convince other boys of their 'normal' masculinity, that is, willing and able to take care of self, which is expressed as able to physically defend self. Paul said boys must be sufficiently adroit in relating to each other through a combination 'talking' and a "muck around push, and you push them back", without the "muck around push" unintentionally, or otherwise, escalating into a 'fight' among boys. Characteristically, 'fighting' is a more **spectacular and obvious** action than 'talking'. As gendered action the former is more closely associated with boys, whilst the latter is more closely associated with girls. Discussions about 'fighting' reveal 'fighting' as largely socially acceptable male way of reaching agreement over issues within male relations. Pupils argue that having a reputation as able to 'fight' best serves the interests of boys in terms of establishing themselves as having a 'normal' masculine identity, which illustrates 'fighting' as having a positive social outcome among boys.

All pupils thought a better form of resolving disputes lay not in 'fighting' but in 'talking it through'. Drawing upon 'speech act' theory, 'talking' and 'fighting' is understood as oriented to communication. Data link 'talking it through' and 'fighting it out', as 'fighting' among girls was described as initially a form of 'talking' that grew into shouting and screaming and finally into pulling hair and punching. In social interactions among boys seeking to gain social acceptance as a gendered 'self', boys are more likely than girls to choose and/or be *socially coerced* into 'fighting', rather than 'talking'.

'Self' control is a gendered thing

Drawing upon Goffman, pupils' comments about the very public character of schooling show the personal and social significance of keeping *and* giving face. Pupils frequently referred to 'soundness' as a quality of personality, which contributed to a person's capacity to act well under stress. A 'sound' person is

considered as reliable, sensible and able to have some fun, within social relations. A person's 'soundness' was evidenced by their show of loyalty to their social group. Forming an impression of whether or not someone is 'sound' largely begins as soon as youngsters enter a school's gates. Boys and girls are judged harshly by other young people when they are perceived as unable to keep 'cool' under pressure (Freund 1998). Often pupils were obliged to enter and re-enter social contexts that were painful to them. In the event of 'loosing' it in public, the social explanation in the case of girls was that she 'mad' or 'bad', whilst for boys it was that he was 'bad' or 'mad' (Hammersley 1990: 61).²²⁰ Pupils frequently talked about the problem of establishing and maintaining 'self' control in stressful situations beyond their control. 'Self' control consists of being able to 'stand up for yourself' without going 'over the top' and 'loosing it' or 'radging' in times of conflict.²²¹

Evidence for these points became most apparent in pupils reportage of a common view that a 'normal' boy must be seen to be able to 'take a joke' and stay 'cool'. Mahmood's comments suggest a boy is seen to be able to remain in control of his emotional responses when under social pressure, especially from other boys.

Mahmood: Frank is small, he's chubby, he's a laugh, he hates people annoying him. And then sometimes Frank ... you know what I mean ... Frank hates it when Tom comes along and goes 'Oh Frank you're so nice, you're SO nice', (emphasises the word 'so') and all that stuff like that ... and he starts annoying Frank and all that...

Frank must not be perceived as 'blowing it' or 'radging' if he is to maintain social credibility with other boys. Boys known to lose their tempers under pressure, for example Mahmood and Matthew in City School, described themselves as "loosing it", perceived themselves as not 'normal' and are perceived by other boys as vulnerable and 'weird' (Fortin and Bigras 1997). Matthew in particular is feared by some pupils. In

²²⁰ Hammersley noted that a teacher constructed a reputation for a West Indian boy as, "... wild, berserk, if you cross him, that's true of many of these West Indians" (1990: 61).

²²¹ The chapter has presented data to address, i) the discursive character of 'negotiated order' at school, and 2) its gendered character. Space does not allow full definition of two important 'gendered gerunds', 'radging' and 'moaning', which are discussed more fully in Chapter Seven.

general social terms they and those labelled in similar ways are not included as a respected participants in social encounters (Goffman 1959).

The social importance of being seen as able to exercise 'self' control applies to girls as well as boys. Kim was frequently referred to as "... 'sound'", which suggested she is perceived as dependable and thought to share in socially approved attitudes towards others and the issues encountered at school. In contrast, Karen when asked whether or not she lost her temper in her relations among girls described her treatment by a particular group of girls in her year.

Karen: No but if they were sniping away sniping away and it got too much and I was going to blow they know that if I'd hit them and they were on their own I've got more chance of hurting them than if they were in a group.

PP: So they stick together.

Karen: I mean they're all nicey nicey if there's just only one.

PP: So do you think they actually get together and plan what they're going to do (...)

Karen: Yeah. Cos its outside class like and in the corridors they like keep saying things everything and nudging you when you pass deliberately and everything and it really annoys me.

PP: Yeah and you don't ever nudge them back?

Karen: No..... felt like it, but, I never have.

Karen's fear of 'blowing' or 'loosing it' in her difficult relations with some of the 'harder' girls, was explained in terms of her brother who was at special school for pupils with 'social emotional and behavioural difficulties'. Karen did not want to be perceived as 'radging' for fear of being negatively labelled as a "psycho". Karen wanted the social acceptance that affords a young person a degree of protection, which is achieved by being perceived as belonging to a social network or at the very least by having one or two 'good' friends who would stick by her in times of conflict.

Troubled pupil relations at school:

Social difference among pupils emerged in forms experienced as dangerous to existing social order. Rory described 'slagging' as a common 'discursive practice' among pupils towards those judged to be different at school. Rory said, "People think you're different and stuff and feel they have to slag you."

- definition of 'slagging'

All pupils talked about a discursive practice called 'slagging' that ranged from jokes between 'real' friends to negative social comments stated in front of others. Pupils across both schools describe 'slagging' as a way of getting to know people as friendly everyday banter *and* as 'getting at' people. Sometimes 'slagging' consisted of criticism *intended* to hurt the person to whom it was directed, for example as a form of social control of 'others' experienced as 'annoying'. A person who is 'slagged' is perceived as strange for some reason, for example as being a stranger or as having different social characteristics from the rest of the collectivity. In 'slagging' the 'different' person pupils expected to provoke a response that opens up talk between the persons concerned. Social status positions among people are shaped by the social practice of 'slagging'. Newcomers can experience 'slagging' as a form of social control of access to existing networks of relationships.

Rory's description, one of *many examples* of this kind of interaction among boys, illustrates a 'fat moment' when a person weighs up how another *ought to* be treated and in this case how a boy is actually treated (Garfinkel 1952: 147). Rory clearly believed 'slagging' others was a shameful way to act.

Rory: ... Cos I know a boy that always gets bullied and if I see someone 'slagging' him I say 'Dinna 'slag' him that's shane'.

PP: You say to him what, sorry?

Rory: Don't slag him because that not, that's shane, you know its not much fair. I tell them (...)

PP That's shane? what does 'shane' mean?

Rory: Not like ashamed.

PP Ohh how do you spell that s.h.a.n?

Rory: No, an E on the end.

PP: Ah right! ashamed ... okay so you'd want to defend the person who's being 'slagged'?

Rory: Aye Aye its not fair.

Mahmood did not have the same degree of social cachet among boys as Rory did. Mahmood expressed belief that formal rules exist to prevent this kind of verbal abuse, "I think that's actually completely out of the law, I mean completely against the law practically".²²² Mahmood's account reveals his focus of attention as mainly upon discovering ways of protecting his own social cachet among boys. In contrast, Rory is able to assert ideas of fairness as a social norm without risking that he be perceived as a 'sad' person because he is prepared to publicly defend a boy who is "... on his own just standing and he'll join your group and people will say 'what are you doing walking with us?'" The "... fat, slow, boring boy" is not picked for football games. There are two obvious negative outcomes of this kind of interaction first, a person's 'self' esteem is damaged and second, others are drawn into effecting another's social exclusion. The process of social exclusion is described as a source of social embarrassment and shame.

Many pupils participate in 'slagging' others in a friendly way intended to be a 'joke', or an expression of closeness between friends, but, it may be intended to hurt. Initial social interactions, which may be fairly light hearted and have a friendly intent can escalate into open hostility between people.

Susie: Yes I mean people can shout things down the street at me and I just turn round and tell them what I think (*Susie moved her head in a way that indicated that she would be able to acknowledge the slagging whilst appearing as if it did not hurt her feelings*) if you know what I mean? ... but I know them ... but if I didn't know the person then I would be like well ... cos you don't know then? (...)

²²² Marriott (1996) argues black masculinity or the theorising of 'blackness' begins with a critique of blackmen being viewed through essentialising concepts of race and sexuality. Marriott argues this perspective rejects "... any notion of identification as a simple process, 'structured around fixed "selves"' (Hall 1992: 255). Analysis of Mahmood's account suggests elements of racism as linked to sexuality in comments he reported that boys made towards him. His treatment by one teacher left him unsure as to the correctness of interpreting it as evidence of racism. These serious matters could not be accommodated adequately within the constraints of the thesis. Drawing on other data within this study, an account from an ethnicity perspective remains to be written.

Kim: ... if it gets to the stage where you just feel really defensive then it gets serious.

Pupils describe 'slagging' as a social phenomenon, that is, essentially 'slagging' depends upon an audience for its maximum effect. The situation encourages a person to express fearful or critical feelings towards another, for example when the audience is with them and shouts encouragement.

Rory: Ah but its when people are like scared and they'll not say anything to you, but, its when they're in groups that they'll start 'slagging'.

PP: So groups give them a feeling of strength?

Rory: Ah ha.

Pupils drew a distinction between friendly 'slagging' and 'bullying', but indicated that it was difficult to establishing quite what was intended by this kind of treatment. People are described as 'slagging' others as a consequence of feeling a sense of social and or cultural difference between them, which when explored through a process of critical comment, can get out of hand and "can evolve into" a 'fight'. In practice, accounts about actual 'fighting' between boys depict 'fights' to be spontaneous affairs largely as a result of 'slagging' or 'stirring', a more serious form of 'slagging', as a way of precipitating a 'fight' possibly after school.

Kim indicated her awareness of relations as process as her comments often referred to the extent and development of relational problems, which raised questions. At what point and what kind of action should be taken in such situations?²²³

Kim: It depends upon what stage its got to, it really depends on what stage it has got to (...)

Susie: If you've got a lot of pals and they bully ye ... it depends on what you mean like I get slagged a lot by all my friends ... by all my pals ... like its just ... I must be one of the most slagged people in the school ... its like as long as you don't take it to heart or anything ... but if you're being really bullied really (...)

²²³ Drawing upon Ambert, A. (1995) 'Towards a theory of peer abuse', *Sociological Studies of Children* 7: 177- 207, James, Jencks and Prout, in *Theorizing Childhood*, note "Preconceptions about children are wavering, a disquiet amplified by ... evidence that by far the majority of the physical, sexual and emotional abuse that any child is likely to receive will be from other children" (1998: 52).

Kim: Mm if you're really bullied you'd have to go to someone.

Kim's comment reveals problems associated with 'having to go to someone'. Major social boundaries between young people and adults, largely defined in terms of age, expressed as 'them', (adults) and 'us', (young people), are maintained by the threat of being labelled for 'grassing'.²²⁴ For girls or boys 'having to' ask for help is further evidence of someone's inability to 'stick up for self' in socially acceptable ways. A negative social outcome for the person so perceived is that others fail to give him/her due recognition (Honneth 1995).

Girls described 'slagging' as a form of joking between girls and across gender relations and that 'slagging' could become a painful experience.

PP: How do you work out the boundary between friendly slagging, (laughing) if you can call slagging friendly, and being under threat?

Katy: You just feel uncomfortable (...)

Susie: But if you've got a lot of pals you don't have to hang about with these people its like ...

Susie described how having a number of friendship networks allowed one to take a rest if someone in one network was not being friendly towards her. Susie's comment that relationships between people were constantly moving, was expressed by all boys and girls.

Boys and girls use of 'slagging' often resulted in a pupil's exclusion from a social grouping. Boys in City School and Gary in Town School, repeatedly described the daily tension of trying to create an illusion of being perceived in a way that would stop continual 'slagging' and relieve their fears for future social relations with other males.

Mahmood: Yeah. You sort of get punished by, you know like pupils sort of going 'Ha, ha, ha', you know, they laugh and you go 'ha, ha, ha' and then you know, point at me that's it (*deeply distressed tone of voice and look on his face*) they probably want me thrown out the class to just sort of slag me for the rest of my life.

²²⁴ The category of 'grassing' is discussed in Chapter Seven.

Mahmood's descriptions of the social effect upon him of the experience of 'slagging' at the hands of other boys shows that 'slagging' is not only a way of communicating a joke, but can also be used as a form of social control in the hierarchical tensions among boys.

Compulsory heterosexuality and sexual double standard

Despite claims for equality of treatment, sexual activity was reported to have different social outcomes for boys relative to girls (Rich 1980). Only two pupils, one boy and one girl, specifically raised the issue of sexuality, other pupils implicitly referred to problems of sexual reputation.²²⁵ Continuity of sexual inequality is implied by the use of the 'popular' reputation, which when used in reference to boys conveys positive meanings, whereas for girls it was potentially negative (Holland *et al.* 1998). Analysis of this contradiction showed pupils used a discursive practice called 'stirring' to find out private or sensitive information about each other.

- definition of 'stirring'

In contrast to 'slagging', which can be described as 'sharing a joke', 'stirring' is action that reflects malicious intent by one person against another. Pupils referred to 'stirring' as an attempt to reconstruct meanings or intentions of past interactions in a negative light. Pupils describe people's intentions when 'stirring' as making statements about another person's actions that are not true. A person who 'stirs' is considered to be trying to make mischief in relations among others. 'Stirring' relies upon the possibility of raising doubt about an actor's personal and social credibility within a collective. A person 'stirred' against may be present, but largely he/she is absent from the discussion. Pupils may find themselves caught up in a 'stirring' discussion, which creates social complexity in addressing the problem and raises issues of loyalty. When the person 'stirred against' hears about allegations that have been made about him/her, it places him/her in a position of having to be seen to challenge the 'stirrer', if the damage is to be repaired. It is a matter of honour! Social outcomes of effective 'stirring' among pupils *and* teachers are some form of relational 'trouble', which has a negative social impact within a collectivity.

²²⁵ My questions did not directly explore pupils' understandings of sexuality.

Boys and girls monitor relations between boys and girls that go beyond just 'being friends', and implicitly a 'normal' sexual orientation is understood by pupils to be heterosexual (Thorne and Luria 1986). The general topic of trust was specifically raised as an issue within sexual relations between girls and boys. Adrienne said she thought boys were more trustworthy than girls with secrets, and although she does have a best friend who she "tells everything to", she is less likely to 'talk' within groups of girls. Although she says she trusts boys with secrets, which implies that her 'life' stories are about sexual encounters with boys, she is sometimes disappointed with them as they make fun of her and call her a 'slag'. Used by girls and boys the label 'slag' had the effect of socially controlling girls friendships with boys, operating as one powerful reason for Thorne's 'with then apart' (1992). The reputation of 'slag' is used by both girls and boys (Lees 1986). 'Slag' is not used generally in reference to boys, although one girl described its use among girls in reference to boys. Jean described her impression that some boys thought a gender divide was a good thing, that boys and girls should keep some social separation. Other girls made the point that girls can be friendly with boys, but not too friendly because their relations with boys were monitored, largely by other girls.

Girls reported girls interest in policing the boundaries of social relations between boys and girls by keeping clear tabs on who is 'going out with' whom. In contrast to boys, who do not experience social disapproval of girls or boys if they have more than one 'girl friend', 'girls are 'allowed' one 'boyfriend'. Girls talk about their relations with boys as sources of stress, as well as excitement and pleasure. Sexual relations for girls with boys reflects a continuity of 'sexual double standards', boys socially accept boys who have sexual experiences with more than one girl, whereas girls opportunities for sexual practice are restricted to one boy.

Jamieson cites Sue Lees and Celia Cowie's study (1986: 68) of 15 -16 year old young women carried out in the early 1980's among girls from three London secondary schools, which was repeated and reported upon in 1993 (Jamieson 1997). The findings of these studies support the continuity of the argument, "... the sexual double standard in sexual conduct (requiring sexual decorum from young women but not young men) undermines girls' relationships with each other: the importance placed on a girl's sexual reputation means that girls cannot confide in each other without risk and possible betrayal" (Jamieson 1997: 98). The term 'slag', commonly used across both schools and in City School, where an additional term 'slapper' was used in reference to girls' relations with boys, that is, girls who are perceived as being too friendly, with too many boys (Griffin 1985). Said with a tone of voice and in conjunction with a raised eyebrow,

which conveyed an impression of this term as being a negative social identity for girls, 'popular' girls contrasted with the positive connotations of 'popular' when used in reference to boys.

Boys did not directly talk to me about sexuality. One exception was Rory who talked about having a sexual relation with a girl. Rory's discussion illustrated a persistence of sexual double standards among boys with regard to girls. Rory argued very strongly for a principle of 'fairness' in his relations between boys especially with reference to a 'sad' boy. Rory described the kind of girl he would go out with, a 'normal' girl as not 'too soft' or 'too quiet' and able to 'stand up for herself'. However, Rory's argument for fairness as a principle of 'good' relations did not extend to girls who were prepared to relate to him sexually. In giving an account of his sexual relation with one girl he described her as "She's just a troublemaker" and a 'bad' girl who was "kiss, kiss, kiss with all the boys." Rory's elaboration of his views about the same girl's relations with other boys, reflected his type casting of her that was justified by reference to her frequent Exclusion. She was described by him as an opportunity to explore his sexuality rather than as a person to have a sexual relationship with. Rory's relations with her did not lead him to define himself negatively, he described himself as "not a 'bad' boy ... [but] a 'normal' cheeky boy." Rory's account of his sexual experiences illustrated his sense that the 'bad' girl is available for him to learn about his sexuality. Notions of limits upon a boy's sexual experience with girls did not emerge generally. Such an opportunity was not reported as available for girls. Boys sexual relations with girls do not appear to be based on norms of loyalty as reflected in their relations with other boys. Boys justify their differential treatment of girls by saying they are "... too young to settle on one girl."

Used with a different emphasis, 'popular' was largely a positive reputation for boys. Pupils references to sexual relations, report boys as treating them an opportunity to explore male sexuality, to impress other boys and as important evidence of heterosexual orientation. Wallace writes, "This too had to be publicly displayed leading boys to invent or exaggerate their conquests when they retold them afterwards. For boys, masculinity was lost, won, or redeemed through their status in the peer group" (Cited in Jamieson 1997: 98).

Underlying fears of being perceived as homosexual are implicit in the data, whilst explicit focus of attention is placed on the practice that marks out a boy as different to 'normal' boys (Jamieson 1997: 98 -99).²²⁶ Boys are effectively socially controlled into 'normal' relations among boys by a socially negative label 'poof', where being perceived as 'one of the girls' often leads to a boy being 'slagged', for example, as experienced by Gary and Elliot. Associations with girls leads to boys being seen as 'soft', implicitly as having an 'abnormal' sexual orientation. Boys clearly continue to publicly denigrate homosexuality and boys whom they consider to be 'homosexual' (Wallace 1987; Connell 1993).

The following description illustrates how the notion of 'normal' male sexuality is played out in social relations between boys. Martino's Foucauldian analysis argues, "... heterosexual masculinities are policed in terms of the category boundary maintenance work ... carried out by certain boys within a heteronormative regime of practices" (1999: 239). Frank is caught in a dilemma, he must be seen as able to 'take a joke' and keep his dignity among 'harder' boys. Frank, a small chubby boy is constantly hassled by groups of 'hard' boys. His emotional reactions to 'slagging' are not 'hard' or 'cool', that is, his reactions suggest he is vulnerable. Karen in Town School describes pupils who are vulnerable in this way "... as a soft touch". Frank fits Karen's description. Boys challenge Frank in ways that implicitly suggest he is perceived to be homosexual.

Mahmood: And there's also things like Frank hates people ... you know... pretending that they really fancy him and all that, especially the boys. That's what they really do to him. They sort of go, 'Right, you grab him, you grab his arms, I'll grab his legs and I'll take his trousers down.' They do things like that and, you know, make a ... you know, they just like a bit of a laugh...

PP: And do they actually take his trousers down?

Mahmood: No, not really no. He fidgets too much when they - they don't hold him as tight as they should, you know, they just grab him and that's it.

²²⁶ Jamieson (1997: 98) notes Claire Wallace's (1987) research findings, in the Isle of Sheppy, "... sexual identities for boys had to be aggressively asserted ... Honour could be won through grand Quixotic gestures of defiance against those in authority - such as employers, the school or the police ... Honour could also be won through predatory sexuality - by aggressive sexism and by "pulling the birds" - and hence was inversely related to girls' sexual honour".

Frank's responses convey his sense of confusion as to how to react to his treatment (Connell 1996:219-220). On the one hand if Frank is seen to be able to 'take a joke' then he is stands a chance of changing other boys opinion of him as a 'soft' boy. The 'hard' boys actions towards Frank are framed as a joke. If Frank responds by crying, this will be seen as evidence of him not being able to act 'hard' or 'cool' he will loose face with the other boys, as boys are denigrated as 'soft' by other boys if they are seen to cry. By definition this is not 'normal' by most boys standards.

PP: And he doesn't like that?

Mahmood: Well he just gets embarrassed to tell you the truth, yeah. Sometimes he hates it if he's in a bad mood and all, but half the time he's always like, he's half laughing and half getting annoyed.

Mahmood described 'popular' boys as 'normal' boys. Pupils stated the former term is commonly used by girls in reference to boys who are considered as sexy. The social interactions between boys described below show that among boys 'popular' boys, described in association with being 'hard', define social norms in challenging social encounters of this kind.

In a context argued to be one of sexual equality, contradictions within sexual double standards, provided dynamic possibilities for 'stirring'. Boys and girls thought girls were *more likely* to engage in 'stirring' as a way of creating or intensifying negative dynamic in relations among girls. Boys and girls stated, when boys engaged in 'stirring' its effect was *more hurtful and damaging* to individuals and the collectivity, as boys were frequently referred to as 'stirring' to provoke other boys into a fight. Common lines included, discussing a person's mother alleging her to be a prostitute,²²⁷ discussing individual girls as 'slags' or discussing individual boys as 'poofs'.

Classroom interactions are reportedly used more by boys than girls as opportunities for 'slagging' and 'stirring'. Interpretation of motive within social interaction is the problem of creating an account of action (Heritage 1984: 108-109). This research

²²⁷ Chapter Three's account of 'trapped at the back' provided a number of examples of this line of 'stirring'. Boys made negative sexual comments about 'mothers'. I considered this particular line of discussion was aimed directly at me as an older woman as it came out of the blue, not bearing any connection to the topic of the video we had all watched in the English class.

draws conceptual distinctions between a young person negotiating 'self' in relation to others in the context of school, as acting self-consciously as a young person and/or as acting self-consciously in a formal capacity as a pupil. In practice, youngsters may view their own or others action from potentially conflicting perspectives, as a young person and/or as a pupil. Teachers, acting self-consciously are also differentiate among pupils according to social norms and formal rules. The next two chapters address these themes.

Summary

This chapter presents analysis of pupils' accounts of informal order at school, which reflects its social, emotional and psychologically complex character, to show that meanings cannot be read off simply in terms of 'class', 'gender', or 'ethnicity'. The issue of 'class', for example, obfuscated in the context of comprehensive schooling, has long been linked to gender. Delamont notes, " the anti-school working class 'lad' ... is as old as mass education" (Delamont 2000). This chapter presents data to show two forms of action among actors at school, 'performance' and 'discursive practice', which are argued to reflect communicative intent. Pupils' categories implicitly embodied 'communicative intent', which to a greater or lesser degree, suggested the presence of an audience (Crossley 1998). Pupils generally reported an expectation that "people" treat each other fairly and show loyalty towards each other in times of conflict with authority figures.

Pupils' experience emerges as socially constructed in reference to everyday rules of interaction in processes of 'continual permutations of action' (Strauss 1993) among actors who draw differentially upon social power. Successful negotiation of everyday relations at school, in the first instance, required actors to 'perform', but actors are also required to 'communicate' competently, for example in giving and accepting 'due recognition' within the collective. Pupils report initial significance of appearance as conveying a person might be someone who can be trusted to be a good friend especially in times of conflict among pupils. Pupils report the positive effects of being perceived as 'sound' as evidence by the ability to exercise 'self' control. By remaining 'cool' under social pressure from peers or adults pupils gain social kudos and acceptance. They are perceived as able to 'stick up for themselves'. In resolving dis/agreements, being seen as appropriately able to 'stick up for yourself' implied an actor as having 'basic trust' in self (Erikson 1980, cited by Honneth 1995).

Pupils' accounts report social relations at school as differentiated by degrees of liking and trust. At a more visceral level, pupils described struggling with negative effects of not 'being liked' by peers or with the sense of social shame that is created when people who are not liked are treated badly. Pupils' accounts reflect the breadth of emotions felt at school; the enjoyments and benefits of social inclusion at school and feelings of shame, blame and/or embarrassment around action which results in social exclusion of 'self' or others. In daily communications, pupils directly 'give' or 'fail to give' social recognition, for example by telling each other what they think and feel about each other. Pupils communicate how they feel towards each other in more subtle ways, by look or smile and by touch. Touch for boys is characteristically a 'push' and 'shove', in contrast to girls whose touch is of a more intimate character. Pupils' accounts show social acceptance, unfair treatment among peers and a desire to feel comfortable at school as common to boys and girls, but describe their expression of feelings in gendered ways. Pupils' feelings are exacerbated by the knowledge that others talk about talk/action at school as they fear a 'bad' reputation among peers.

As categories of 'communicative action', 'gendered gerunds' reflect the character and detail of 'distorted communication' among pupils in everyday interactions. Boys describe girls in normative terms as more likely than boys to engage in 'talking', often denigrated as 'chatter', which is perceived stereotypically as a 'natural' and largely socially approved mode of communication between girls. Girls hold similar views of themselves except they do not denigrate girl's talk as 'chatter'. Among girls 'talking' continues to be stereotypically ascribed as a natural and appropriate way for girls to communicate with each other, whilst among boys 'talking' is perceived as a specifically female form of communication. As concepts, 'talking' or 'fighting' refer to forms of normative interaction that confirm boys and girls who act in accordance with them as 'normal' and therefore socially acceptable.

Analysis of pupils accounts of interactions at school, showed the significance of discursive practices, for example 'talking', 'fighting', 'slagging' and 'stirring' as constituting negotiation of social differences among pupils. Gender relations are clearly governed by reference to a continuum of 'hardness', against which a person's 'hardness' is discursively negotiated according to gender norms. Stereotypes of boys as 'hard' and 'fighters' and girls as 'talkers', evidently act as normative referents in interaction. The dynamic and interactive character of pupils experiences at school are evident, in the regularity of 'palls aw falling oot'. Among boys, 'falling out'

frequently described as being expressed in physical ways, in contrast to girls who are described as shouting and screaming at each other. Frequently girls stop talking to friends they 'fall out with' for all manner of subtle reasons (Griffiths 1995).

Pupils refer to different ways of resolving disputes/agreements among pupils 'talking it through' and 'fighting it out'. As a form of 'communicative action' the former is normatively associated with girls, whereas the latter is normatively associated with boys. Nevertheless, pupils give examples of boys seeking to resolve disputes/agreements among boys by 'talking it through' and girls seeking to resolve disputes/agreements among girls by 'fighting it out'. Most pupils agreed 'talking it through' is the best way of reaching agreement, because as Gary said, "You can get your feelings out". Pupils recognised 'fighting it out' as coercive in character, some drew upon ideas that transcended gender inequality to argue that if 'fighting it out' is an inappropriate way of reaching agreement for girls it must be inappropriate for boys.

The gendered implications of 'talking' and 'fighting' emerge as contradictions to claims for gender equality. Everyday rules of interaction emerged as shaped by stereotypical ideas of how boys and girls ought to act. Youngsters used two main negative sexual labels, for example, 'poof' and 'slag', the former applied to boys, and the latter applied to girls, which signified stereotypical norms of 'sexual relations', which are forms of social control exercised by youngsters as they learn about sexual orientation and practice. Being perceived as acting inappropriately according to social and gender norms raises issues of physical and emotional safety for pupils. In practice, pupils use of 'gendered gerunds' reflect a continuity of normative heterosexuality as shaping pupils' discussions about 'self' and others as gendered actors at school.

Chapter Seven

Classroom relations at school

"It takes two to tango"

Introduction

Teachers' present a curriculum to pupils within four conceptually distinct sets of relations that constitute schooling: *informal* relations among young people; *informal* relations among young people and their teacher; *formal* relations among teacher and pupils; and, *formal* relations among pupils. This chapter continues Chapter Six's focus on 'discursive practises' that lead to social inclusion/exclusion, to make empirical links with educational inclusion/exclusion, as processes in which 'identity' or 'identities' emerge as "... points of temporary attachments to the subject positions which discursive practices construct for us" (Hall 1996: 6). Chapter Seven draws upon pupil accounts and my own observations in and around City School and Town School to illustrate everyday formal life at school. Among accounts about Exclusion, pupils' criticisms of formal interactions at school receive less serious attention than adult accounts (Gow and McPherson 1980; Tattum 1982).²²⁸ This chapter presents data to illustrate ways in which formal rules and gendered norms shape the 'what', 'how' and 'who' of everyday attempts to resolve dis/agreements emerging among teacher/pupil relations.

Pupils' perceptions of everyday life at school

Everyday relations inevitably involve dis/agreements between actors, which provide the discursive referents for creating accounts of everyday life at school. Robin, for instance in Chapter Five describes a pupil's formal reputation and social identity as being partly constructed on the basis of pupils' observations of classroom discussions between pupils and their teacher. A contradiction lies at the heart teacher/pupil relations; pupils argue that in social interactions with other pupils

²²⁸ See Lesley Gow and Andrew McPherson (1980) *Tell Them From Me*, Aberdeen, Aberdeen University Press, for ground breaking research with Scottish pupils. Tattum's focus on 'disruptive pupils' adopted a Millsian approach to 'disruptive and violent behaviour' to focus his research on "... pupils' expressed motives for their behaviour as a way of perceiving and analysing secondary schools and thus as a step towards a sociological understanding of disruptive pupils behaviour" (Tattum 1982: x-xi).

and teachers a pupil doesn't get any attention unless they "... get known". Chapter Six highlighted personal and social significance of being able and seen to "stick up for yourself", but pupils argue that among teachers they are 'known' as a 'good' or 'bad' pupil. Gary said "... once a teacher fingers you with a bad reputation that's you forever". Teachers are said to expect pupils to stick to 'type' (Hargreaves *et al.* 1975). Pupils argue they are not allowed to 'stand up' for 'self' to explain their actions as teachers construe pupils' attempts to explain as 'answering back'. Classroom interactions are constrained by a risk of being construed by teachers as 'being cheeky' 'or speaking out of turn' (Tattum 1982: 63-64).

Pupils *and* teachers accounts of dis/agreements at school constituted a moral discourse, which is evidenced by the stress they lay upon the importance of 'talking through' problems of in/discipline. Pitkin writes,

The point of a moral argument is not agreement on a conclusion but a successful clarification of two people's position vis-a-vis each other (Pitkin 1972: 154).

Pitkin refers to Austin's study of excuses,

From this perspective, the characteristic setting for moral discourse is one of dialogue among persons who are actually involved in what has happened; such discourse is very much contextual. No doubt we can contemplate moral principles in the abstract or hold public discourse about them, but, the centre of gravity of moral discourse falls in personal conversation between an actor and someone affected adversely by what he did (Pitkin 1972: 150).

Despite evidence of teachers' *and* pupils' claims that dis/agreements over interpretations of pupil action constitute a moral discourse, data show everyday conditions of schooling generally did not allow for dialogue between actors about 'non serious' acts of in/discipline, which gave rise to charges of unfair treatment and feelings of frustration.

Pupils' accounts show a teacher's rightful authority is 'taken for granted'. Pupils *expect* fair and equal treatment from teachers for boys and girls, for example in terms provision and participation in the curriculum and to protect them from harm in times of stress. Pupils' accounts show they expect *and* accept that some form of sanction or punishment be meted out to those who fail to act according to social norms and school rules. Pupils' views illustrate Garfinkel's breaching 'experiments' conducted to establish everyday rules of interaction, noted failure to act in a way that is 'trusted' in everyday interactions is considered by actors as a 'morally sanctionable fact' (Heritage 1984: 103). Pupils understand the conduct of teachers to be governed by professional rules and

regulations. Pupils consistently note teachers vary in the degree to which their actions conform with pupils' ideas of what those professional rules and regulations require. Pupils recognise teachers experience 'bad' days, but in times of stress and conflict over pupils' failure to comply with a teacher's expressed or assumed expectations of them, pupils believe that by drawing upon their training, teachers will be able to act professionally, which primarily meant treating pupils fairly.

Pupils argue that teachers generally tend not believe their accounts of troubled interactions. A pupil with a 'bad' reputation is even less likely to be believed and are thought to be responsible for and blamed in advance of an inquiry about a 'troubled incident'. Pupils describe situations in which pupils with a 'bad' reputation, who may be involved in a disruptive incident, are likely to be 'picked on' by teachers (Hargreaves *et al* 1975).²²⁹ Teachers take this action in classrooms and in group situations when details of events leading to the 'disruptive incident' are not immediately apparent. Teachers 'picking on' a pupil 'who started it' is perceived as a quick strategy for re-asserting his/her control over a class intended to focus pupils' attention to their school work. Rory argued strongly against the injustice of teachers' use of this shaming strategy.

Rory: ...they just chuck you out without thinking about it....umm ah that's it. If you've been in any trouble before and you've been involved in a fight and even if you say you were innocent and they started it and came over and hit you, they just give you an exclusion because you have been in trouble before.

I asked very carefully, "Don't you think teachers do any talking between them to work out why something happened?"

Rory: Nuh they dinna believe ye.

A generally held view among pupils was that teachers acted as if all pupils were not to be trusted when debates arose over the question of who 'started it'. Pupils describe two main outcomes of this unfairness: a pupil or pupils who *ought to be punished* are allowed to 'get away with it' and that a 'bad' reputation is often unfairly

²²⁹ Hargreaves *et al.* (1975) do not use the term reputations, but argue teachers possess a stock of common-sense knowledge about the accomplishment of deviance and conformity among their pupils. Drawing upon self-fulfilling prophecy theory (Rosenthal and Jacobson 1968) and labelling theory (Becker 1963) and their data, authors develop 'a theory of typing' by which pupils are recognised (known) as telling a lie and are claimed (known) to be a liar.

reinforced as teachers often refer to a 'picked on' person as a 'troublemaker' (Hammersley 1990: 60).

Chapter Three discusses 'sheets' and the School Liaison Group (SLG) agenda as strategies of support for *pupils* 'in trouble' at school. Teachers with guidance and discipline responsibilities and classroom teachers varied in their awareness of the workings of the SLG, but most were familiar with 'sheets'. Most people in the study knew that parents were contacted by telephone or letter to inform them of what was happening to a child 'in trouble' at school. These strategies can be viewed from two perspectives, as 'control' and/or as 'support' of pupils 'in trouble'. However, pupils loose 'face' among teachers, for example in my hearing a teacher expressed surprise when a pupil proffered a 'behaviour sheet' at the end of a class.

Pupils' descriptions of 'disruptive incidents' reveal stereotypical ideas of gender as playing a part in teachers' attempts to keep a class focused upon their school work tasks. In times of troubled classroom dynamics, pupils' perceive teachers, particularly weak teachers, to call upon stereotypical views of gender to help him/her to keep control of a 'troubled' situation. There are three strands to pupils' arguments about gendered inequality at school. Firstly, teachers were perceived as having gendered expectations in relation to 'behaviour'; girls will generally 'behave well', whilst boys will generally 'behave badly'; in practice teachers treated girls less harshly than boys. Secondly, actions of girls known to have a 'bad' reputation are not responded to in the same way as boys. On the one hand, boys argue that girls are often ignored, on the other, girls argue that noisier girls are 'picked on' more frequently than other girls or boys as their actions are not tolerated to the same extent as boys. Finally, girls who have gained a 'bad' reputation, that is are known as a 'bad' person in a functionalist sense, are deemed to be 'worse' than 'bad' boys'. Pupils argued that people 'picked on' for 'bad' behaviour in class experience increasing degrees of educational exclusion and **in serious cases** either *informal* or *permanent* Exclusion.

Troubled interactions at school: 'behaviour' or 'communicative action'

Action is judged differently by different people. Accounts of a 'bomb scare at City School', for example named officially as 'serious rule breaking' showed a variety of views about how the school 'ought to' have responded to two pupils who telephoned the information that a bomb had been placed in the school. Variations in opinions among pupils with regard to the above particular 'serious act of

in/discipline' pointed towards an inevitability of teachers being charged as treating pupils unfairly, for example over less serious matters.

Conventional accounts of pupil in/discipline focus upon affects of action, which *to a greater or lesser extent*, challenges and disrupts a school's formal agenda (Munn and Lloyd 1998). Action termed as 'bad' behaviour or 'disaffection' is 'taken for granted' knowledge; we all know what we mean, for example that throwing a chair at someone is 'bad behaviour'. The meanings attributed to 'behaviour' are referenced to codes of conduct, which by definition do not allow for actors meanings to be heard. Analysis of pupil data through the concept of 'behaviours' led to the creation of individualised accounts that relied upon typifications of pupils as 'types of pupils' and action as 'types of behaviour', in which explanations of 'gender relations' were difficult to address (Hargreaves 1975; Tattum 1982).²³⁰ Linguistic philosophers argue against trying to create an explanation of action in the language of 'behaviour' as it logically points to 'events' and 'cause and effect' and a positivist account of action (Pitkin 1972: 140-149). As an analytical category 'behaviours' proved inadequate to explaining a rise in Exclusions for 'bad' behaviour. Pupils unequivocally described 'throwing a chair' as "out of order" and explanation of such an action by definition required a reflexive analysis.²³¹

In the absence of what pupils called 'good' relations, pupils *and* teachers rely on a third party to act as a go-between in relational problems. Officially the domain of guidance, this pastoral work intended to support pupils' personal and social development is a necessary aspect of gaining access to the curriculum (McLaren

²³⁰ The Warnock Report (1978) recognised the relational aspect within a need for special provision for children "with severe emotional or behavioural disorders who have very great difficulty in forming relationships with others or whose behaviour is so extreme or unpredictable that it causes severe disruption in an ordinary school or inhibits the educational progress of other children" (para. 6.10). For children who are experiencing this degree of relational problems the problem can be conceptualised as 'distorted communication' and the issues this raises for assessment and provision of education in accordance with his/her particular educational needs.

²³¹ I use the concept 'reflexive' in Garfinkel's sense that, in contrast to Parsons, reflexivity is the act of making 'action' accountable as a central social activity in which rules are not 'taken as given', but actually worked out in time. The importance of Garfinkel's analysis locates all actors within the frame of reference, no one is outside the events that he or she describes. "... the activities whereby members produce and manage settings or organized everyday affairs are identical with members' procedures for making those settings 'account-able'. The 'reflexive' or 'incarnate' character of accounting practices and accounts makes up the crux of that recommendation" (Garfinkel 1967a: 1).

1999: 415- 424). Adverse effects of 'bad' pupil/teachers relations on a pupil's learning and a teacher's teaching of the pupil In terms of deviance/conformity as negotiated in Giddens notion of a 'dialectic of control' (Giddens 1984: 16, 374)(Giddens 1984: 16). Ball cites Hoyle's call to brave the "organisational underworld" of schools, arguing each school has a 'micro-politics' all of its own, which I extend to include *pupils in relation to teachers* (Ball 1987: xi). Negotiations of dis/order at school vary in their outcomes. People experience positive, negative and unintended impacts upon subsequent interactions in class and around the school, thus a range of interests shape the nature and character of negotiations of this kind (Barnes 1979; Woods 1983). In seeking to resolve dis/agreements about action that threatens informal and/or formal order at school, actors act *with communicative intent* (Crossley 1998: 16).

Problems 'in' and 'out' of class

In this section data is presented to show 'bad' relations in class create ambivalent and/or negative social resources, which necessitates a teacher's reliance upon coercion to get pupils to 'behave' and do their school work. Chapter Six drew attention to a range of 'gendered gerunds' that I argue are forms of 'communicative action' at school. In class, 'slagging' or 'stirring' gives rise to or intensifies disputes among pupils, which have a negative social effect, either 'short term' or 'long term'. In the former case, disputes in class were evidently counterproductive to positive experiences of learning and teaching as they produced an unpleasant 'atmosphere in class'. A 'long term' effect is measurable in terms of negative impact upon 'academic performance'. This section illustrates three commonly used gerunds, 'moaning', 'grassing' and 'radging' to illustrate forms of communication adopted when formal conditions constrain everyday interactions.

Problems encountered by particular pupils (Mac an Ghaill 1996: 151), often create on-going stress between him/her and a teacher, who try to resolve a problems by asserting the relevant formal rule as a basis for resolving a dis/agreement.²³² Generally written down and/or displayed, formal rules refer to aims and purposes of schooling and/or the school ethos as distinctive from social 'rules' referring to

²³² For a discussion of this point see Mac an Ghaill, who cites Green (1982: 23) who alerts readers of policy statements to beware of missing a critical point: policies are intended to address 'problems encountered by' pupils 'in trouble' not to address pupils as 'the problem' (1996: 151).

everyday courtesies for example, pupils speak to teachers more formally than they would with their peers. Teaching and learning rests upon 'taken for granted' rules of courtesy, for example a pupil is expected to 'do homework' and is expected to answer honestly when asked why it is not done.²³³ In conditions of an imbalance of formal and social power, positive social resources are not created in interactions where negotiation of problems are constrained within an assertion of social norms and formal rules, for example if a teacher says "Well you know what the rules are", which show that if pupils are to learn they must be 'able to' and 'willing to' co-operate with a teacher. In the absence of reaching a 'mutual agreement', a teacher must resort to compelling pupils to conform by sanctions and punishments. Holmwood and Stewart make an important point about the social effects of coercive power.

... Coercion can never be the long term basis of social organisation since coercion is never *expansionable*. The translation of power into actions mobilising coercive sanctions destroys resources (Holmwood and Stewart 1991: 121).

Whilst Rory and Adrienne get 'in trouble' with their parents and teachers for 'talking' in class' instead of working, they stress pupils *ought to do their school work* in class. 'Talking' is defined by the pupils themselves as conversation which is not directly relevant to the school work. Pupils also comment that 'talking' and 'working' are activities which 'pull against' each other in the sense that 'talking' in effect prevents them from doing their 'school work' as well as *they* or their teachers or their parents would like. From this normative perspective, Rory and Adrienne perceive that teachers 'pick on' a pupil as a strategy for ending the interaction which disrupts learning and teaching in the classroom. Pupils generally argue when a teacher is told who did 'start it' he/she does not listen to or believe pupils. Consequently the person who 'started it' is not punished. Pupils' accounts show they think punishment is 'in order', but pupils get 'bad' feelings about this teacher strategy for restoring 'formal order' as it creates a 'bad' atmosphere in the classroom. Whilst Adrienne said that in times of trouble "... you're your own mind so you cannae blame your pals can ye..." that is, people have to take responsibility for their

²³³ See Hargreaves *et al* (1975) for a comprehensive account of the different kinds of rules isolated from pupil and teacher accounts. Rules set up as lists however, face the same problematic as lists of 'behaviours' in that a list does not convey the incoherence and inconsistency characteristic of common-sense thinking about schooling as practise, in which pupil acts at school "... can be described in various ways and several rules can be invoked by a single imputation of deviance" (Hargreaves *et al*. 1975: 105).

own actions. Pupils argue that a 'bad atmosphere' increases their need to 'talk' to each other about how they feel.

Elliot reported,

Elliot: I can't really keep concentrating for so long as I should do ... I get frustrated if I don't understand it. I'm thinking about Maths here because this is what always happens ... he tries to explain everything to us and to begin with I think 'Oh I can't quite understand this but I'll just keep listening really hard and see if I can understand it'... Then he goes over it and it kind of makes sense but doesn't ... I tend to drop it because everyone gets a bit annoyed at me keeping asking questions.

Elliot talks to other pupils in class in attempts to smooth his social relations and gets 'sent out' for 'talking in class'. Elliot's 'chatting' contributes to his alienation from other boys.

Pupils' experienced teachers' variations in their interpretation of 'taken for granted' classroom norms, for example in their tolerance of pupil talk in class defined by pupils as superficial chit chat or a 'working hum'.

Jean: All the teachers are different. Like some teachers they'll let ...like in Geography, he'll let you talk as much as you want as long as you get on with your work he doesn't mind. In Maths you have to do your work in silence and that's it, you're not allowed to whisper a word.

If pupils 'got on with their school work' teachers were more or less tolerant of talk in class. Pupils 'talking in class' broke a general code of conduct for classrooms that pupils must not 'talk in class'; 'talk' characterised as reflexive talk was thought to be focused on 'out of class' matters. Susie's way of expressing her point of view, for example contrasted with Kim whose manner was calm and dignified in comparison to Susie. Their social differences could be attributed to their different social and cultural capital.

Susie singled out a teacher's treatment of two Asian girls as unfair; she argued that they were allowed to 'talk' in class, whilst she was constantly told to stop 'talking in class'. Susie denigrated the girls as 'swots' and as 'irritating' and 'annoying'. In classroom observations I had noticed the girls 'chatting a lot'; neither of the girls were ever challenged by teachers. Other pupils considered the two girls as 'academically able' and referred to them as "'swots' who got their 'school work' done". Susie's frustration with having to conform with codes of conduct that she

considered irrelevant, was exacerbated by her awareness of teachers differential treatment of these particular girls. Her view of formal codes of conduct as largely irrelevant to everyday life at school was given further credence by her observation that teachers did not conform with the sequential ordering of sanctions and punishments associated with the codes of conduct, for example a teacher might go straight to the top of the tariff and issue a detention without giving a prior 'verbal warning'. Time exacerbates tensions around rule following as a rise in tensions is associated with a gradual reduction of co-operative resources between actors. In such conditions learning and teaching is experienced as coercive and pupil's references to 'moaning' reveals the on-going character of problem solving at school.

- definition of 'moaning'

Pupils describe teachers and pupils 'moaning' at others as a demand for action or a challenge to failure to act; 'moaning' implicitly makes reference to sets of rules that state what *ought* to be done in the circumstances. Relations between A and B are assumed to be governed by an mutually agreed set of rules as the basis of order for their relationship, for example Phillip (A) reported teachers (B) as 'moaning' at him for repeatedly failing to hand in his homework. The characteristic tone of a 'moaning' voice implies the problem is familiar, that it cannot be ignored, but that B has little expectation of positive change, for example that Phillip will bring in his homework. Challenge is too strong a word as the very tone of voice conveys to A, and any 'audience' present, that B has little expectation of A being able or willing to comply with what is being asked of him. A on the other hand, hears the tone of voice and responds to that tone rather than the legitimacy of the demand and A literally switches off his/her attention to what is being said. The communication fails to resolve the problem of A's not following the rule and effectively fails to endorse B's legitimate professional authority over A or the class.

When asked to describe what 'moaning' means pupils change their tone of voice from a conversational tone to a 'whine' or a 'whinge' tone, which connotes the person is feeling a sense of personal **powerlessness**, but nevertheless has to say what they have to say in deference to formal demands. Teachers 'moan' at pupils in discussions around a pupil's failure to comply with a punishment exercise. Pupils describe 'moaning' at teachers to communicate distress or frustration in relation to punishments imposed by teachers for rule breaking either because punishments are perceived as not justified or as too severe. Pupils report pupils 'moaning' about demands to do school work as excessive or about conditions experienced as stressful, for example to have to work in silence for long

periods of time. The social character of 'moaning' is evidenced by its negative effect upon the 'atmosphere in class'.

Pupils described 'moaning' to be gendered in as much as they perceive a difference between what boys and girls 'moan' about. Girls are described as 'moaning' to each other about their relationships, whereas boys are described as 'moaning' about things that they have to do, for example homework or punishment exercises. Women teachers are described as more likely to 'moan' and especially at boys.

A school's formal statements about its ethos makes reference to notions of ethics and moral sentiments that are expected to be brought to bear upon negotiations arising out of this kind of situation. In formal contexts, negative emotions are created in situations where actors cannot negotiate agreement, for example pupils may 'moan' about having to sit next to people whose company makes them feel uncomfortable. Pupils find it difficult, for example to justify avoiding a person who is labelled as 'sad', whose outward appearance may look okay. He/she may not have any obvious facial disfigurements or be dressed differently to other pupils, but physical proximity to him/her gives rise to uneasy feelings. Having to sit next to a person or be taught by a teacher whose presence has a powerful negative interpersonal affect is a matter that is very difficult to discuss without sounding offensive and discriminatory.²³⁴ In a very real way actors' feelings create relational problems that impact upon the organisation and practise of school work. In classrooms, actors in this kind of situation, with differentiated access to information and power, may turn to Guidance to help ameliorate their problem, but largely pupils use avoidance strategies, for example 'skiving' or act in ways that limit contact with persons who make them feel bad, for example 'slagging' a person so that he/she will sit next to someone else.

²³⁴ A male teacher I interviewed wore a heavy aftershave lotion. Later in the day I sat down in my office to listen to the taped interview. I was still aware of the smell of his aftershave lotion as it clung to my clothes. In contrast to all the other male teachers I interviewed, the teacher had been aggressive to the extent I had felt really uncomfortable during the interview. As I listened to his voice on the tape I became aware my feelings of discomfort had returned. The tone of his voice and an awareness of how he smelled seemed to combine into a 'not nice' feeling. At the time, I noted thinking it would be very unpleasant *to have to be taught* by him for a whole academic year. Thankfully I did not *have to talk* to him again. I reflected upon the negative effect such feelings could have on learning. In contrast, Rory made frequent references to the perfume of a woman teacher in Town School. Rory reported his pleasurable feelings and sharing those feelings with other boys in his class. The teacher's perfume was described as marking out a space of pleasure.

Social boundaries at school

Pupils' accounts frequently refer to 'grassing', which draws attention to social boundaries between pupils and adults and among pupils. When teachers fail to act as pupils think they 'should', pupils often turn to a Guidance teacher to help them resolve ensuing problems; a decision that highlights problems of trust associated with transcending social boundaries.²³⁵ An important social norm assumes pupils should not give information about relations among pupils to a teacher. Pupils describe 'grassing' as breach of trust in relations between young people, a deceit considered as the ultimate act of disloyalty (Holmwood and Stewart 1991:123). In the context of school, pupils use this category most strongly in reference to adult/pupil boundaries. Pupils expect teachers to show 'respect' for other teachers and described a 'bad' teacher one who does not keep *expected* social boundaries between pupils and teachers by showing loyalty to his/her colleagues. Ellen, for example commented in shocked tones that a temporary female teacher had criticised her Guidance teacher's handling of pupils at a time when a colleague of long standing had committed suicide.

- definition of 'grassing'

Pupils describe 'grassing' as a form of communication initiated by a pupil between 'self' and a teacher or other adult about matters that other pupils may perceive as social business among pupils and not adults/teachers. A pupil who initiates this communication with an adult *expects* that adult to be *able* and *willing* to exercise professional authority and power over pupils to effect some positive change in relations among pupils precisely because he/she is unable, for whatever reason, to resolve problems *within* the boundaries of pupil relations. The pupil who engages in 'grassing' allows adults to 'see' into a private social reality, which is perceived to dilute the autonomy of that private world and in so speaking the pupil crosses a forbidden social boundary. The pupil who 'grasses' to a teacher risks losing the respect and trust he/she has among pupils and cannot subsequently expect to draw upon loyalty between pupils.

²³⁵ Pupils' expectations that teachers are capable of acting professionally, echoes Parsons's notion of the professions, which according to his functionalist ideas of social system, professions in modernity act as a disinterested expert in their specific field. See T. Parsons (1954) 'The professions and the social structure', in *Essays in Sociological Theory*, New York: Free Press.

Appropriate observation of these boundaries in class is experienced by pupils in contradictory ways. Pupils have to wear two social hats, one denoting his/her informal relations as a young person and a second denoting his/her formal relations as a pupil. On the one hand, teachers have legitimate formal power to assert the formal claims of learning and teaching over informal relational claims. On the other, pupils have social power to accept or reject a teacher's claim. Social tensions created out of balancing responses to informal and formal relational claims contributed to what pupils and teachers called the 'atmosphere in class'.

Karen's account reveals the social complexity of 'grassing' in its description of contradictions she encountered by choosing to act in defence of 'self' by breaking codes of loyalty with peers. Karen distrusted teachers for not taking her claims seriously evidenced to her by the fact that her experience of bullying by other girls had not ceased.²³⁶ Subsequently, Karen lost trust in her few friends who Karen felt had 'grassed on' her by talking to the Guidance teacher about specific instances of negative treatment they had observed her receiving from girls in their class. This in turn had led to more 'bad' treatment of her. Cooper argues that absence of trust is characteristic of pupils who experience problems of this kind at school (Cooper 1997). Karen argued that bullied persons have poor 'self' esteem and little 'social' worth among peers as he/she lacks a socially acceptable quality of 'hardness' argued to protect against being targeted by others seeking to establish their own 'hardness'. Albeit differentiated in gender specific ways, Gary, Mahmood and Jessie's accounts reflected similar stories, which characteristically showed delicacy and tact as necessary requirements of adults who wish to support a children 'in trouble' in his/her social world. Importantly, I distinguish between actions leading to 'short term' social effects of 'pride and fellow feeling' rather than 'embarrassment, shame and humiliation' (Scheff 1998: 398; Goffman 1967). I am not referring to control/deviance in class terms of 'resistance' and 'domination' in relation to labour market aspirations (Wolpe 1988: 58 -61).²³⁷ All pupils recognised a relationship

²³⁶ Karen's situation was a matter of discussion on the school's SLG agenda, which suggests her claims were taken seriously, but it must be stressed that Karen did not perceive that to be the case.

²³⁷ See Wolpe (1988: 246- 271) for a discussion and critique of A. Furlong (1986) 'Schools and the structure of female occupational aspirations' in *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. vol. 7, no. 4: 367 -378. Furlong argues that girls' 'consciousness' is shaped by their mother's limited labour market aspirations, which contributes to their own limited labour market aspirations, a view that follows from Sharpe (1976).

between 'academic' performance and labour market benefits, however these were considered 'long term' matters.

The very **public** character of 'negotiation' of dis/agreement between a teacher and pupils raised points of personal interest for pupils *and* teacher, who must be seen *in gender approved ways* to maintain their dignity or 'cool' if they are to avoid getting a 'bad' reputation. A teacher, for example confronted with 'fighting in class', which is not tolerated under any circumstances, is publicly tested both personally and professionally relative to the combatants; who are most likely to be boys. A boy or girl who loses his/her temper to a degree called 'radging in class' is judged to be a 'radge' or a 'psycho' and he/she quickly gains a reputation associated with madness.

- definition of 'radging'

A pupil category, 'radging' refers to the expression of intense emotions; perhaps of fear, of frustration, of anger and/or extreme distress, which is often construed by 'audiences' as madness. In 'radging', people often cry and have a red face, whilst they express their emotions in a destructive way either verbally expressed as shouting and swearing at those around them and/or physically expressed by throwing objects at people or actually punching and hitting another person. In 'radging' a person is characterised as having lost their 'self' control in relation to a person or persons who continue to retain their self' control. Pupils use the term 'radge' to describe a person whom they perceive as having "blown their 'cool'". Effectively, the person has lost their capacity for 'talking it through'. As 'communicative action', 'talking it through' entails two actors who are prepared and able to communicate with each other, that is are able to talk and listen in turn to what the other is saying in relation to negotiating a resolution of disagreement. As an form of communication 'radging' suggests relations between the person who has 'blown it' and others is in danger of or well on the way to breaking down.

Social atmosphere around a person who is 'radging', literally and normatively, is not 'cool' as it becomes charged with tension and heightened emotion for everyone who is present. Other pupils may well be frightened by this display of loss of 'self' control. As a form of expressing feelings 'radging' is open for all to see, it claims the attention of those around that person because their words and actions are potentially **dangerous** to 'self' and to the other or others present in the room. Scheff argues 'self-esteem' could be defined by reference to " ... the balance between 'pride' and 'shame' states in a person's life taking into account both duration and intensity" to argue social control is effected through shame and conformity (Scheff 1988: 399).

Pupils use battle metaphors when describing 'radging', for example 'blow' and 'target'. The latter conveys the social character of 'radging' as pupils give accounts of pupils who deliberately attempt to provoke a pupil who is known as a 'radge' or as a 'psycho' by sniping at taunting the person as they go about the daily relations of school.

As a form of communication 'radging' is extreme and least positive in its personal and social effect; 'radging' leads to loss of 'self' -esteem and loss of informal and formal social status. 'Radging' is a source of 'shame' and obvious non-conformity with everyday social norms, carries strong gendered implications. Pupils were fearful of the physical strength of 'radging' boys. Accounts of girls who 'radge' comment less on this element. Teachers commonly stated "... girls are worse than boys", which suggested boys and girls actions are judged in reference to normative gendered ideas that girls 'talk it through' whilst boys are expected to 'fight it out' and are afforded greater licence (Fortin and Bigras 1997). In his discussion of grief and crying, Tomkins argues that men mask sadness with anger whilst women do the opposite, masking anger with grief (Tomkins 1963: 64-65).²³⁸ Girls in this research were more likely to withdraw from painful situations that may make them feel sad or angry, in contrast to boys who must show that they can be 'hard' in the face of painful situations.

A boy or girl who 'radges in class' is taken out, by a class teacher or someone called to assist, in order to provide him/her an opportunity to 'cool' down, and so that 'social' and 'formal' order are restored in the classroom.²³⁹ Indicative of a socially vulnerable person, 'radging' is construed as socially unacceptable, therefore the person who acts in this way is open to social exclusion and possibly Exclusion and/or transfer to alternative forms of education. Despite different reasons for personal difficulties with 'school work', Rory and Susie expressed a general view

²³⁸ See Tomkins, Silvan S. (1963) *Affect/Imagery/Consciousness*. New York: Springer.

²³⁹ At Town School, I was shown around a classroom used for 'learning support' teaching, a pleasant room and full of light. Two pupils were working quietly at different tables at one end of the room. The door suddenly flew open. A boy, whose race was red and flushed and whose breathing was clearly audible, was brought in by a Guidance teacher who had been called by a classroom teacher to take the boy out of his class. The atmosphere became electric. With dramatic speed, all possibility of continuing the existing discussion stopped abruptly. The boy's distress claimed everyone's attention. I felt embarrassed for his loss of 'face' and anxious that my presence as a stranger would exacerbate his distress. I left the room immediately.

among pupils that punishment is 'in order' as school work is the point of being in a classroom.

Poor conditions for learning and teaching

The significance of a 'knowing' relationship between teacher and pupils and its effect upon learning were reflected in pupils' accounts of teachers described as 'not my real teacher', for example the 'student' teacher. Pupils' accounts show student teachers and to some degree 'supply' teachers are perceived by some pupils as vulnerable, as fair game, as an opportunity for some fun at the teacher's expense and whose lessons provide an opportunity to avoid working hard. A 'student' teacher arrives at a school relatively free of a reputation in the sense that he/she is at the beginning of a professional life, pupils' perceived as a teacher to be tested. A 'student' teacher is doubly disadvantaged as he/she is not 'known' to the class nor does he/she possess the authority of a fully fledged teacher. Significantly, the 'student' teacher does not 'belong' in the school; his/her time at school is limited and relations between teacher and pupils are generally a temporary affair.

'not my real teacher': temporary work

Matthew's account of a class I had observed showed how pupils challenged a 'student' teacher. My observation notes describe four boys as " ... persistently and relentlessly" refusing to co-operate with the young male teacher's request to 'get on with your work'. The teacher was well prepared for the Geography lesson and remained energetic and enthusiastic in his presentation of his subject. He attempted to gain the boy's interest and maintained a courteous tone of voice with the boys as he continued to teach the lesson to the rest of the class. Throughout the two periods, the boys continually pushed and shoved each other whilst sat at their desks (Woods 1990b:5-7).²⁴⁰ Eventually, one boy threw a screwed up piece of paper that caught the side of the teacher's head. At that precise moment, the bell rang to mark the end of the lesson. In the normal chaos of pupils leaving class, the teacher asked the boy to stay behind. The teacher asked the boy to explain "... his behaviour"; after a brief response he was verbally reprimanded and asked to write an essay on 'bad

²⁴⁰ Woods (1990b) draws upon Beynon's (1985: 37) category of 'sussing', which refers to six ways in which boys deliberately try to provoke and stress a new teacher. The boys' intentions are described as trying to test out the teacher's claims that he/she will not tolerate any 'nonsense' among pupils in class. It could be argued that 'sussing' emerges as a male form of 'communicative action' intended to find out whether a teacher is interesting and worth listening to, in terms of subject knowledge.

behaviour'. The rest of the class had appeared unconcerned and worked well. The act of 'wrong doing' emerged from an eighty minute long dynamic between four boys; one boy was 'picked on' and punished; establishing who 'started it' would have taken an inordinate amount of time and the wisdom of Solomon. According to Robin, who defined a 'good' teacher as able to contain interactions among boys *and* teach a topic in an interesting way, the 'student' was a 'good' teacher.

'not my real teacher': 'yuffty' work

At short notice teachers are obliged to fill in for colleagues, which leads to class time experience that does not necessarily involve a teaching and learning relation between teacher and pupils. Teachers whose free period coincides with an absent teacher's period are effectively told by school management 'you hufta take a class', giving rise to a colloquialism 'yuffty classes'. As an organisational strategy designed to cover teacher absence from school that was negotiated between teaching unions and local educational authorities, 'yuffty' arrangements reflect teachers 'class contact time' with pupils. Put another way, these arrangements secure time for teachers preparation and marking of pupils' school work. 'Yuffty' classes are taken by a teacher who may or may not be either personally familiar with the pupils or knowledgeable about the topic of pupils work. Usually, a 'yuffty' teacher takes to the class work he/she *expected* to do in what was timetabled as a free period as it *assumed* pupils will do work set by the absent teacher or by the head of department for the subject. A 'yuffty' class is characterised by an absence of *learning and teaching as an interactive experience focused upon a scheduled topic*. In 'yuffty' classes observed by me, relations between class and teacher were characteristically 'custodial', a point acknowledged by teachers. For forty or more commonly eighty minutes (the time of a double period) pupil were expected to work independently and quietly.

During the research I experienced a number of 'yuffty' classes, which were characterised by a distinctive atmosphere, frequently as sharp and tense by comparison with 'normal' classes. Teachers largely seemed unable to relate to pupils in a personal way either individually or as a group. Some pupils were 'known' from past experience as teacher's spoke to pupils by name. In contrast, pupils came together as a class for a number of periods a week. A sense of group identity among them was strong. In 'normal' classes, a teacher/class relationship was reflected in a 'hum' created as a class became a 'working' group. The 'hum' in 'yuffty' classes was noticeable by its absence. In an atmosphere that felt fragmented, foci of interest emerged from small group interactions. A 'yuffty' teacher's interactions with pupils

characteristically addressed issues of deviance/conformity by constant reference to official codes of conduct. Pupils' accounts show feeling safe at school depended upon pupils having confidence that codes of conduct were both meaningful and enforceable. Observations of 'yuffty' classes showed meaning as negotiated, in which teachers differential treatment of pupils reflected their reference to gendered norms.

In contrast to 'following a pupil for a lesson' my observations latterly took the form of 'following a pupil for a day'.²⁴¹ The former experience contrasted sharply with the latter in that I observed how pupils often had a common frame of reference, for example 'good' and/or 'bad' feelings experienced in one class were carried forward to another class. The teacher, excluded from shared knowledge of pupil's experiences of the day, had the task of setting a work agenda based upon an expectation that pupils would be 'self' motivated to do their school work. Central to that expectation, pupils were required to have a capacity to accept the academic discipline required to sustain their attention to the set school work.²⁴² To preserve the integrity of the data and to allow the reader access to nuances that help make the narrative sensible, I present a 'yuffty story' in the following way.

Mrs Gregor's treatment of boys relative to girls

The following description of classroom interactions among pupils and their 'yuffty' teacher Mrs Gregor, took place in the last two periods of the day. Their classwork consisted of working out maths problems prepared in advance by their 'normal' Maths teacher. Their 'yuffty' teacher was unable to give pupils help with Maths as she taught home economics. Pupils were effectively expected to work without direct teaching for eighty minutes. Mrs Gregor's differential treatment of pupils was

²⁴¹ All classroom observations had been negotiated with teachers and pupils, a time consuming and exhausting exercise, when I was informed that school year effectively changed before the end of the academic year. Pupils were re-allocated into S4 from S3 classes, which wrecked my plans completely. I sent a general note to teachers that I would be 'following a pupil for a day', whilst I asked for the consent of the remaining pupils. I checked with the school secretary each morning for notes of objection.

²⁴² Jessie, was 'followed for a day', in which by chance only one of her classes was a 'normal class'. All of her classes were foundation/general classes. Jessie's experiences could be explained through ethnicity, class and gender. Jessie's negative experiences at school were explained by reference to her psychological/social problems, which had the effect of obscuring general issues of provision, participation and protection in relation to her education.

marked, for example she treated girls differently from boys. She also treated two groups of boys differently and within one group of boys she treated Paul, the pupil that I was specifically observing, differently from the other boys in his group. Second, girls acted differently to boys, a point that raised deep feelings of astonishment and surprise on my part. Most girls complied with Mrs Gregor's demands. Most boys failed to co-operate with Mrs Gregor's demands. Only one girl challenged the teacher's interpretation of school rules through a request to visit the toilet.

I arrived at the door of the classroom having followed Paul from a foundation/general biology class. The noise level in the classroom itself was considerably louder than any I had experienced in the course of four weeks' observations. Pupils were crowding into the classroom where they appeared to choose where to sit. Boys at the back of the classroom were 'wolf' whistling, shouting at each other and across the room to other boys, which directly challenged Mrs Gregor's personal and professional authority. Mrs Gregor immediately 'sent out' two boys to another classroom along the corridor. The noise and swiftness of the decision to exclude the boys from class created a sense of dis/order and an atmosphere heavy with potential threat. I felt very uncomfortable.

Meanwhile the six girls in the class had sat to one side of the room. Boys in the class formed two groups, one consisted of eight boys in two rows or four, who sat to the right of the girls. These pupils were sitting facing the teacher who stood behind a desk at the front of the class. Behind the girls and boys described above was another row of desks divided into two. The second group of boys, situated behind the girls, consisted of three boys who faced each other and away from the teacher. I sat to their right behind the other boys.

Mrs Gregor's initial attempts to encourage a group of six girls to do their work drew upon her expectations that they would want to meet their Math teacher's expectations. One girl observed in a clear straight forward tone of voice "Mr Alwin hasn't a clue about anything".²⁴³ Pupils appeared to lack personal and professional

²⁴³ At the time I did not know who Mr Alwin was. During analysis I realised that Mr Alwin had taken a 'yuffty' class, which space does not allow me to describe. Characteristically no active teaching took place. The class was a Math's class, but the pupils were foundation/general and not pupils that Mr Alwin usually taught. However, Mr Alwin's 'yuffty' class was every bit as distressing as Mrs Gregor's. In his case, boys' actions were

respect for the absent teacher and as will become clear, pupils did not appear to have a respectful relationship with Mrs Gregor either.

Part of the initial confusion related to demands by three boys, one of whom was Paul, to leave the classroom in order to return to the biology lab to look at the results of their experiments. I was drawn into this discussion by the boys to verify its truth. It later became apparent that the teacher didn't know who I was or what I was doing, although my presence and research had been carefully described in writing by me to all teachers and officially announced in the staff bulletin. The three boys persisted in their demands and the teacher gave them permission to leave the classroom. I went out of the classroom with the boys, who were not issued with a 'permission to leave the classroom' slip, unlike Lucy who later debated with the teacher around the issue of the absence of a 'permission slip' to go to the toilet.

On my return from the biology class, I passed the group of boys on a table at the back of the classroom. Andy said, "Fuck". The boy next to him remonstrated with him for using bad language. A little later the same three boys quietly began singing a song with repeated references to "cunts". This experience reminded me of a previous 'back of the classroom' experience between me and a group of S3 boys which included sexual comment.²⁴⁴

Throughout the eighty minutes session, boys were more or less constantly cajoled by the female teacher to get on with their work, whilst girls were commanded to get on with their work. Three distinctive frames of reference were drawn upon by the teacher when she responded to pupils. The boys in the front group were spoken to more sharply than the boys in the back group, whereas the girls were spoken to more sharply than any of the boys. The teacher called out to three boys discussing football "A wee bit too much chat and not enough work." Paul, in the front group, was frequently called by name and so was a boy called Andy, from the back group. However, Andy was not spoken to with the same sharp tone of voice. When Paul called her to show her his work she responded "It's very ill mannered to interrupt." In contrast, in a kindly tone of voice the teacher remonstrated "Come on Andrew let's get cracking eh?" At one point a girl called out "Mrs Gregor. can I borrow (...)" the teacher cut her off saying "There's a please in there!" The girl then repeated her

ignored with serious consequences, whilst the few requests girls made of him were responded to quietly.

²⁴⁴ See Chapter Three in a discussion called 'trapped at the back'.

request putting in 'please' as directed. One of the boys who had been sent out of the classroom kept opening the classroom door to ask if he could come back in. The teacher did not take him seriously simply replying "No" to his repeated question. The teacher repeatedly called "boys!" and "get on with your work" as she tried to get the boys to be quiet.

Most boys persisted in conducting conversations not related to school work and in activities that prevented those around them from concentrating on school work. Boys in the front group focused their attention on each other. Two boys in this group were distinctive in that they quietly attempted to do the maths work as they used a calculator. Boys from the other group appeared not to have calculators and called to the boy with the calculator to provide them with information. Five of the eight boys in the front group appeared to be from various ethnic backgrounds. Her tone of voice was sharp with one of these boys who was experiencing problems with understanding what to do with his work, as she asked "Any difficulty?" The teacher clearly didn't know any of their names as she had to ask who they were. She commented "I should know your names." This comment contrasted with her response to Paul, a member of this front group. She watched Paul very carefully, telling him to "stop showing off". The 'yuffty' teacher knew his name although Paul was relatively new to the school unlike the other boys in his group. The other boys in his group were part of the constant movement and talk that Paul was involved in. They were not singled out for reprimand.

On what was effectively a 'boys side' of the room, noisy intra-group discussions were accompanied by pushing and shoving among boys, who appeared to be relieving the boredom of the lesson. They took care not to directly challenge the teacher. Paul, for example watched the teacher very carefully as he firmly 'persuaded' a boy to let him stick a watch with a Velcro strap onto the boy's curly hair. He appeared to have little choice in whether he wanted to have a watch stuck to his hair. Paul had previously slapped the boy on the back of the head. Later, in his interview, Paul described this boy as his friend and said the slap was a 'joke'. Paul constantly pulled at a curl on the front of his own head, conveying a sense of 'inner' tension.

A trio of boys to my left, who had participated in the initial 'whistling', focused attention partly on each other, but partly on Mrs Gregor. They appeared to keep some kind of a balance between their interactions and sufficient school work to keep Mrs Gregor convinced that they were doing their work. Andy remonstrated with

her about the impossibility of working with all the noise in the classroom. She replied "Don't worry about anyone else." He began to argue with the teacher as the other pupils laughed at her idea. In reference to boys sent out of class earlier he asked "Can I get sent through please?" The teacher ignored his request. Andy audibly asserted "This is crap." David, another boy in his trio, became involved in a kind of cross fire exchange with the teacher. Mrs Gregor accused him of not working. He said "I have!" She said, "You have not." He said, "I have so." The teacher then let the point go as silence descended on the class. A boy in the front group put his head on the desk. The silence was almost as nerve wracking as the noise. My notes recall my feelings of tension. The bell rang. The lesson had forty more minutes to go.

A few minutes later, a boy directly attempted to provoke Mrs Gregor by reflecting sunlight from a his watch face directly into her face. She ignored this action. Mrs Gregor then remonstrated more firmly with Andy "Andrew I would like to see you doing some work." He responded "They aren't doing any work so why should we?" She ignored his comment. As she patrolled around the girl's side she said "Lucy do some work. Chewing gum!" Mrs Gregor's way of speaking to Andy was striking when contrasted with a sharp automatic tone that did not invite discussion. Lucy pulled a face behind the teacher's back. Her tone of voice was noticeably different again as almost reasonable, she turned to say "Paul put the chewing gum in the bin! There's a rule here!"

In the last thirty minutes of an eighty minute session, the girl who had commented upon the absent teacher, called out "I can't concentrate with these boys."; breaking a contrasting quietness in what felt like the 'girls side' of the room. Lucy began a long drawn out request with the teacher to leave the room to go to the toilet. Mrs Gregor responded very differently to her in comparison to her response to the boys. She could not locate a 'permission slip' and was not prepared to let Lucy go without it. Earlier the three boys were allowed to go out of the classroom without the question of a 'permission slip' being raised. Eventually, after a lot of 'moaning' on Lucy's part, a permission slip was found. Lucy left class to return shortly saying there wasn't any toilet paper and could she go to the toilet in another building. The teacher ignored her. Lucy asked every few minutes to go to the other building. Lucy eventually began to plead with the teacher "I'm really needing!" and the teacher let her go to the toilet. Very shortly Lucy returned to say as she returned to her seat "The toilet is closed ... it's shocking...". In witnessing these interactions, I felt embarrassed and angry for this pupil's public humiliation.

The final bell rang. The class dispersed in an atmosphere of total disintegration of order. Two pupils obeyed the teachers request to put their chairs on the desks before they left.

My notes record my impressions of having spent eighty minutes in an atmosphere that lacked any sense of purposeful control. Mrs Gregor's attempts to assert her professional and personal authority required constant reference to formal codes of conduct and threats of sanctions. In the main, boys' negative actions contrasted with girls' conformity. One group of boys were directly challenging and disrespectful to the teacher and made no attempt to do the school work. Another group of boys indirectly challenged the teacher and showed little interest in school work. Between them they created a noisy stressful atmosphere. Two boys had kept their attention focused upon their school work, whilst all of the girls 'played the game'. The 'lesson' was experienced by me as socially disordered, characterised largely by an absence of liking or respect between teacher and pupils. Most of my 'yuffy' experiences convinced me that the absence of teaching/learning created conditions in which pupils and teacher shared a sense that they had to 'get through the time'.

Atmosphere in class

Pupils made frequent references to 'atmosphere in class', qualified as 'good' or 'bad'. Pupils explained an 'atmosphere in class' by reference to a range of features, the character of verbal communications among actors in a classroom, the amount of light in a classroom and the way that the furniture was arranged. I related strongly to this point as observational notes contained many references to my feelings of discomfort in some classes. I had not organised my observations according to the 'normative ordering' of pupils according to standard grade examinations, but I particularly noted a 'brittle' character to the 'atmosphere in class' often associated with foundation/general classes.²⁴⁵

Observations suggest teachers quickly attempt to engage pupils in formal tasks by directly calling for order so the class can hear instructions. Seating arrangements in classrooms acted as a significant contributory factor to creating an 'atmosphere' as

²⁴⁵ One of the most impressive examples of professionalism and patience I witnessed was in a foundation/general class. Two teachers worked together with a class to help them prepare for a school trip. I nevertheless felt really tense as by that time I had come to know of tensions among some of the pupils. I had a severe headache by the end of the class. I felt such respect for the teachers and their pupils who got through the tasks set out for them.

different arrangements increase or decrease the degree eye contact between pupils and the teacher, which created a greater sense of privacy between pupils. Pupils choice of seat in class, in pairs or fours, revealed a 'gender order' as boys sat with boys and girls sat with girls, which derived from outside 'social ordering'. In classrooms a pupil's social exclusion is very obvious, as Robin described in answer to my question,

PP: How do you think people exclude people from a group

Robin: They're like ignored or they're not allowed to work with them like they'd sit at other tables. I've seen it with boys as well. I mean I've gone to sit down at a table and two of the other boys sitting at that table have moved, sat up, stood up and moved to go across to another table just because I've come to sit there.

Robin's description shows the subtle and painful ways pupils' socially exclude some of their peers in class.

City School pupils largely sat in single sex pairs or around tables in same sex groups of three or four. In some classrooms, for example in science labs the furniture consisted of long benches or large tables, boys and girls sat at the same table, but girls would be seated together down one side and boys seated together along the other side. Pupils groupings were characterised according to sex and ethnicity, for example whilst I observed Scots or white pupils in pairs. I often observed girls differentiated by minority ethnic backgrounds in pairs and groupings. Boys also appeared to form groups where the most obvious defining features was an apparently shared ethnicity. Among pupils social complexity was clearly differentiated by sex, ethnicity and socio-economic background.

Whilst shaping different forms of sociation among pupils and teacher an arrangement of desks signalled a teacher's teaching style. Elliot described furniture arrangements as contributing to the kind of jokes that could be told. Elliot said "So therefore you can - I mean in Mr. Bell's computing class we kind of end up making jokes with each other maybe rude jokes and things ... in Computing we've all got to sit in a circle with your computers and Mr. Bell's way over at the other side of the room." Elliot said " ... each teacher has different limits some are more liberal than others." Elliot also suggested furniture arrangements gave some indication of how liberal a teacher might be towards jokes. Elliot compared Mr. Bell to Mr. Black, "Mr. Black doesn't .(like rude jokes) ... but if you started telling that kind of thing in the Mr Black's Geography lesson, because it's a different lay out of the class it's, because you know, joined up, the rows are in desks and

the teacher's out the front teaching". The more traditional and possibly less liberal teachers were perceived to convey that notion by organising desks so that pupils faced in one direction the class was taught from the front. All of these features evidently combined in different ways to create tangible differences in the 'atmosphere in class'. I witnessed the same class with different teachers; relations with one teacher were easy and the lesson proceeded uneventfully, whilst with a second teacher some pupils created serious 'disorder'. The difference seemed to turn on the fact that some teachers were able to command respect and due deference from his/her pupils.

Pupils report weak male teachers as attempting to control boys by resorting to their knowledge that boys do not like to be shown up in front of other boys. Such teachers through subtle use of 'sarcasm' and/or sanctions, embarrass boys either through shaming for not being as 'mature' as they ought to be and/or laying blame for action without investigating it thoroughly (Braithwaite 1989). Ellen and Kim, for example discussed a male teacher who treated boys in this way whilst his treatment of girls was experienced as 'sleazy'. Boys were described as 'going for the jugular', whilst the girls felt sorry for him. Girls argued that weak female teachers, using the same techniques as weak male teachers nuance their appeals according to traditional stereotyping of girls. Such teachers, for example Mrs Gregor, are noted for attempting to control girls by shaming and/or blaming girls over trivial matters. Boys fail to take such a teacher seriously, whilst girls get caught up in complicated arguments with the teacher. The 'atmosphere in class' came to signify a correspondence between pupils 'respect for teacher' and a quality of learning and teaching that one could expect to witness in the time that followed.

Social and/or educational outcomes?

During classroom observations I was consistently aware of a social phenomenon between pupils that I called 'social connectedness', evident among pupils who talked to each other sufficiently often, either one to one or in small groups of three or four, that an observer quickly developed a sense of the pupils concerned as a some way socially connected. Added to the observation of talk between a pair or group of pupils the way pupils used their bodies heightened my sense of their social comfort in each other's presence. They sat close together making lots of physical and verbal contact, for example to borrow a pencil or in sharing a text. In the main most pupils had someone to relate to in this way. I am not claiming these were relations between friends, however I am claiming that they conveyed a sense of social comfort and support. In a Maths examination class I noticed that despite the fact that pupils did not talk to each other I

still got a sense of 'social connectedness' as happening between pairs and groups of pupils. In this context the 'social connectedness' was evidenced by facial expressions between two pupils made in response to the exam questions and in an apparently easy borrowing of a rubber between two girls or in an exchange of smiles between two boys.

I observed a Maths Standard Grade formal assessment, supervised by two young male teachers one of whom was a student teacher. The class of thirty young people sat at individual desks in fairly cramped conditions. Twenty of the class were girls and ten were boys; three were missing. The teacher explained carefully to the pupils what they had to do and how they were to do it, which included maintaining silence throughout the process. The student teacher moved around the desks making sure that every pupil had the necessary equipment to carry out the tasks involved in the examination, for example calculators and pens. The teachers worked well together and seemed confidently in control of the situation. The quiet tone of their voices and the comfortable manner in which they worked around the pupils gave the impression that their division of labour was evidence of careful preparation.

The following descriptions are included to show how commonly social relations significantly constrained educational processes. Gendered differences are strikingly illustrated by a dynamic transition by Amanda from a pupil 'self' to a social 'self', which contrasted with Robin, who seemed *unable* to bridge the gap between 'able' pupil and a socially acceptable boy.

Both youngsters are academically able; their capacity and willingness to participate in school work at this level suggests they have accepted the academic discipline required to do well in school work. Amanda appeared to be socially included in a high status network of friends, in contrast to Robin whose social standing with other pupils, boys *and* girls, was relatively poor. He appeared to be dressed the same as the other pupils, but his social interactions with other boys were observably distant, which gave the impression that he was socially unacceptable. He exemplified what pupils' described as a social 'loner'.

Robin was not included in the sorts of intimacies I describe above. He sat at the edge of the classroom and worked quietly without interacting with pupils around him. Robin did not seem to have any social connectedness to other pupils; boys or girls. I did not see him make eye contact with another pupil throughout the roughly eighty minute long examination process. My notes recorded that pupils around him sat with their bodies turned away from him. Robin finished his exam before everyone else. One of the

teachers walked quietly to Robin's desk, checked his work and touched his shoulder with a smile as he said "Thank you" for the exam script. Robin almost smiled back and I realised that in the days that I had been observing Robin I had not seen him smile once. He continued to sit quietly.

Observing Robin in the examination class, I found it difficult to concentrate on him as his presence in the room was so low key that even though I was aiming to notice him as carefully as possible, other pupils non-verbal interactions were so much more interesting. I noticed Amanda whom I had seen the day before while waiting outside a classroom door at the change over bell. In a noisy corridor Amanda had walked up Adam, who was also waiting to go into the classroom, taken hold of his hand and then his collar as she pulled him towards her. She kissed him with some passion. Talk around them stopped. She let him go and walked on up the corridor without a word to anyone. I had felt like a voyeur, however, I do not believe that the young woman had seen me. (I am a small woman and was standing to the right of a pupil who was taller than me and the kiss had taken place to his left.)

Throughout the examination I recorded Amanda as very focused upon her work. A number of times she had quietly raised her hand to get points clarified and to ask for more paper. As the examination time drew to a close, signalled by a slow building of a verbal hum among the class, the young woman put her school things away into her bag; her pens, pencil and her rubber and ruler. She pulled out a compact from her bag and using its mirror she combed her hair, dabbed her face with some kind of lotion and put these things carefully into her bag. Next, she took off her black fluffy cardigan, which looked dull and serviceable, to reveal a white skimpy belly top. The contrast was arresting; my eye was drawn to a lot of bare tummy and back above the top of her jeans. She carefully folded her cardigan and placed it into her bag. Amanda put on a denim jacket hanging from the back of her chair. With its collar up and her bag grasped in her hand she waited for the final bell. A personal and social transformation had been effected before my very eyes. Amanda had transformed herself from a co-operative hard working pupil into a confident young woman ready to hit the social life beyond class. My notes record that Robin, chewing gum and looking gloomy had slipped down in his seat conveying the impression that he was disappearing from the social scene.

The bell rang, the chatting among pupils exploded. Robin walked his solitary way to the classroom door. He did not smile or betray a flicker of acknowledgement as he passed me. I knew not to acknowledge him.

Order, order, order: in classrooms

Pupils describe an 'orderly' classroom as necessary for teaching and learning. Pupils' accounts show that as a condition of 'formal' order, social 'order' in class derives from resources of trust and respect created within 'good' relations between teacher and pupils. Giddens cites Erikson's discussion about trust in relations between children and adults "Trust here equals confidence and very early on, Erikson suggests, it has a definite mutuality to it: there is at the least an incipient feeling of 'being trustworthy' associated with the generalised extension of trust to the other." (Giddens 1984: 53). Among pupils and teachers qualitatively different social relations shaped teaching and learning. Bonner draws upon Hannah Arendt's discussion about learning, who

... says that 'learning in the old sense' involved forcing students into an attitude of passivity... the student has to discipline him/herself because learning involves work. On the other hand, 'learning in the new sense' avoids force by emphasizing play (Bonner 1990: 18).

Bonner cites Arendt, who writes, "A good student is one who helps to bring out the student in the teacher and a good teacher is one who helps to bring out the teacher in the student." (Arendt 1968: 3-32).²⁴⁶ In general conditions of *mistrust* constrained formal relations at school; for some pupils a building of trust between them and teachers is a positive outcome of everyday relations at school, but for others it is not the case.

Pupils differentiate between teachers on the basis of *personal* ability to engage socially with pupils and *professional* knowledge and presentational skills. Teachers described as able to bring these qualities together do so by active engagement with pupils in the school work. Pupils assess teachers largely on the basis of the degree to which a classroom is experienced by pupils as 'orderly'. It is the 'stuff' of teacher reputations and careful consideration of them offered some indication of pupils' normative understandings of what constitutes 'good' teacher/pupil relations.

Pupils in Town School and City School characterise 'good' formal relations as having a quality of 'mutual respect' between pupils and teacher. Phillip, for example in Town School experienced being shouted at by a teacher in class as indicative of

²⁴⁶ See Hannah Arendt (1977) 'The Crisis in Education' in *Between Past and Future: Eight exercises in political thought*, New York: Viking Press.

an absence of respect for him and other pupils. Pupils in both schools described ongoing feelings of stress created by actors 'shouting in class'. Usually it was teachers who shouted. Phillip had said he did not like teachers who shouted at him. " ... No cos like if they're shouting at you, you are no really learning anything, because you're just shouting and that, but you have to give the teachers respect so that they willna shout." When teachers shout at pupils, Phillip indicates pupils may shout back at the teacher. A teacher with a reputation for 'shouting in class' is not able to create a relationship of 'mutual respect' between teacher and pupil or create a sense of co-operation towards a 'good' learning and teaching relationship. By implication, the 'good' teacher sets a calm and professional tone or atmosphere by 'speaking to' rather than 'shouting at' pupils, which allows the lesson to proceed.

Many pupils, like Phillip, draw attention to the importance of relations of 'mutual respect' when describing how they feel in situations where they think 'mutual respect' between teachers and pupils is largely absent. Phillip's arguments were extended by Lillianne who articulated a perception shared by a number of pupils that in practise school rules and codes of conduct were regarded by many pupils as points of order to be negotiated between a teacher and pupils. When Lillianne thought teachers were not being fair Lillianne generally challenged teachers interpretation of codified rules, arguing "It takes two to tango". In contrast Gary said " ... Ah always treat teachers with respect ..." Gary went on to say " ... even though they probably have a bad reputation like for being soft (...)". I interrupted Gary, "A bad reputation for being soft?!! Do you mean that they've got a bad reputation for not keeping control?" Gary replied "From bad people, yeah ... I think it's the different teachers. Some can handle the class and you know you won't be ... misbehave and that. But like softer teachers that can't handle the class you can ... some people might say they would go and misbehave." However, an important qualification needs to be made; some pupils, described by their peers as 'bad' pupils, may not have the same opinion of the teacher who cannot keep control or is ill prepared to teach. Pupils described those classes as opportunities to 'have a joke' at the teacher's expense and usually, the 'joker' was male. (See below)

Pupils recognised that pupil/ teacher relations are not necessarily underpinned by feelings of mutual regard. Phillip, for example, indicated that liking and being liked is not necessarily something that can be counted upon in school life. In reference to one particular teacher Phillip said, "... I dinna like her so, but some folk like her and some folk dinnae." I asked Phillip if he thought teachers " ... get upset if they think pupils don't like them?" Phillip said, "Nah, because they probably dinna like you

either so..." An important point which pupils in both schools and in all categories mentioned, a 'good' teacher cares about his/her pupils as persons and as pupils.

Most pupils state a main concern they have about a teacher is that he/she is "capable" of doing his/her job. Robin, for example had no preferences for male or female teacher "I don't really mind... It depends if they're ... if they're a capable teacher who you can understand I'm fine with that." I clarified this point to ask "You just want them to teach and keep control?"²⁴⁷ Robin said "Yeah. I don't really mind (about the teachers gender)". Gary, Mahmood and Robin described an important outcome of teacher's capacity to keep control of class dynamics; they felt safe from other boys. Karen described fearing two girls currently in one of her classes who had beaten her to the ground in the previous year; she was frightened of 'loosing it' with those girls and getting herself into formal trouble.

- *'gender order' in class*

Pupils' responses to direct questions about their views on the relevance of gender in relation to teachers show the majority of the pupils interviewed considered a teacher's gender was not a main concern. The question was considered irrelevant, but pupils' spontaneous references to gender told a different story (as above). Teachers were commonly thought to consider boys as expected to 'behave badly' relative to girls affording boys a greater degree of licence, whilst girls are generally expected to 'behave well'. In situations where girls and boys act 'badly' in similar ways, a girl will be judged more severely than a boy. Only two pupils spontaneously expressed a preference for women teachers and no pupil expressed a preference for male teachers. Women were described as more likely than men to have a reputation for being a 'kind' teacher. Rhona and Elliot, in separate interviews, volunteered the view that in their experience women teachers were kinder to pupils, boys and girls, than men teachers. Male teachers were generally thought to be less strict with girls and the actions of girls who have a reputation for being 'bad' are not responded to in the same way as boys and in fact are often ignored. Rory, for example described a male teacher who consistently failed to challenge a girl in his science class over actions that Rory thought 'ought to be' addressed that were addressed when boys did the same kind of things.

²⁴⁷ The reader is reminded that Chapter Four reports Robin's description of feeling "paranoid" about his safety in class, particularly with respect to other boys.

Pupils argue some teachers are unable to assert a rightful professional authority over the class. Pupils' accounts showed some male and some female teachers were known as having a weak 'personality' and a known lack of interest in teaching his/her topic clearly. When a 'class' share this perception of a teacher pupils frequently experienced a poor 'atmosphere in class'. Kim, for example described a male teacher as acting in a 'sleazy' way towards girls whilst he frequently 'isolated' and publicly ridiculed boys in the class. This teacher routinely 'sent out' Russ from the class almost as soon as the class commenced.²⁴⁸ Ellen described a male teacher as 'sad' and unable to control boys in his classes who attempted to exercise control of the classroom dynamic by frequently challenging girls in his class, over what were perceived to be minor issues generally and certainly in comparison with more rowdy interactions between boys in the class.

Pupils sometimes welcomed stereotypical gender relations with teachers. In Town School, Lillianne described men and women teachers as treating boys and girls differently illustrating her point in reference to her perception of gendered approaches to pupils with 'behavioural difficulties'.

PP: Do you think that teachers find it difficult to help you with your problems?

Lillianne: Their just - like if I just got a teacher and I had been bad, probably they'd just be embarrassed to talk about it.

PP: That's what you think, they would be embarrassed?

Lillianne: Aye but they're adults and they're - they know what they are talking about.

PP: Is there any difference - do you find it easier to talk to men teachers?

Lillianne: What kind of problems?

PP: - about getting into trouble in the classroom.

Lillianne: Aye I do...

PP: Yes. You find it easier?

²⁴⁸ Observation of this particular teacher's class noted Russ's absence from the class, but he was 'sent out' immediately on arrival because he did not have any books with him. His removal had happened so fast that I had not time to note who was 'sent out'.

Lillianne: Because men teachers are just - you go - I've been bad today and they'll say yes well and they'll sit and tell you how you should behave.

PP: Right and what about women teachers?

Lillianne: I dinnae really say to them - I think women oh -

PP: - go on -

Lillianne: - its -

PP: - keep going just say what you've got to say -

Lillianne: I think the women teachers - eh - listen to boys more - and men teachers listen to girls more. Have you never noticed that? I think they do. But that's say if like - I like it that way, because the men and women are not being sexist - like because if I was to go into my maths class - like I've got a woman teacher - she wouldn't just say come and see me and leaves the boys out she goes to both of us. But I like it that way better than men going to the boys and -

PP : Okay so you feel that people talk about problems across genders -

Lillianne: Aye.

PP: - and you feel it's easier that way? - but you don't feel that teachers don't teach to boys and girls?

Lillianne: Nuh nuh.

Lillianne drew a distinction between 'teaching and learning' problems and 'personal' problems acknowledging that her personal problems clearly shaped her schooling in negative ways. Lillianne is a pupil who needed constant adult support whilst at school. Pupils judged teachers according to their capacity to balance distinctions between pupils' experiences of problems in relation to learning and in relation to their personal life. Susie reflected a pupil view of teachers as largely not interested in pupils' personal lives and as mistaken in choosing to focus on academic 'performance'.

My 'real' teacher

Interactions between pupils and teacher can be characterised along two axes; the professional and the personal. Pupils referred to a 'normal' teacher as one they *expect* to meet for the duration of an academic year. Pupils' frequently qualified a

description of teachers and teaching by referring to "... my 'real' teacher" a phrase that connoted a person they knew well. Pupils expect 'their' teacher to turn up on time, that he/she be adequately prepared and equipped with materials needed to teach the *timetabled* topic. Pupils were rarely ambivalent about a teacher. Whilst attempting to be fair in their account pupils differentiated teachers in terms of degrees of attachment. Time spent regularly together facilitated the creation of social resources between a teacher and pupils, either positively or negatively (Høeg 1994). Actors evidently drew upon resources of co-operation to help 'get through' 'troubled' times.²⁴⁹ Rory's story below illustrates the quality I am trying to capture.

Exacerbated by the very public character of schooling, pupils talked a lot about coping with unhappy feelings and perceived teachers as having similar difficulties. Rory, for example described a teacher who in the past was considered fair in her dealings with pupils. As a class, pupils responded in a compassionate manner to 'their' teacher whom they thought was unhappy; implicitly she was a 'real' teacher whom they knew and liked. Rory said " We once had this teacher [she had taught them in S1 and in S2] who had obviously had a bad day and she was crying while she was teaching us ... We just all behaved very good." Rory smiled as he remembered the lesson. I asked " ... cos you could see she was upset? Rory replied "ah ha ..." I asked. " ...you didn't 'get' her because she was upset?" Rory said "Nuh, we just thought we'd better behave because we thought that was a shame, a shane... so we just thought aw we'll no give her a hard time and then the next period she was 'oh thanks very much for good behaviour' and then we went bad again!" We both laughed in a shared understanding of how circumstances change how we act towards others.

The teacher was clearly personally vulnerable and 'her' class was able to extend a compassionate response to her. However, once the teacher was back to 'normal' more robust boundaries between pupils and teacher were replaced. As this case illustrates, drawing upon resources of co-operation built up in earlier

²⁴⁹ Taking account of time remains a problem for social theory, for example Garfinkel argues the "... role of time as an essential component in the unfolding succession of 'here-and-now' reconstitutions of the actors' circumstances is ignored ... time in the theory of action is treated as a 'fat moment' " (Garfinkel 1952: 147, cited in Heritage 1984: 108-109). Social/educational outcomes of schooling for all pupils are shaped within 'fat' moments of negotiations between actors, often constrained within inappropriate or poorly resourced circumstances.

times teacher and class negotiate shifts between social relations and formal tasks.

Ellen and her Mum's perceptions of Mrs. Morgan, a Chemistry teacher at City School, illustrates an interrelation between a teacher's personal and professional qualities. This case illustrates how positive communication between Mrs. Morgan and Ellen's mum enhanced an existing relationship between Ellen and Mrs. Morgan; a relationship they had built up over the preceding year. Ellen and Katy at City School discussed their teacher. Ellen said "She's our friend as well as our teacher." Katy agreed "Yeah." Ellen repeated "She's our friend as well as our teacher ... I've had her for a year ... my mum likes her ... she got to meet her [Ellen laughs] she got to meet her at parent's evening, she said 'She can co-operate, she's more humane than the other teachers ... acting as a teacher.' She got there and she was um ... she was talking about her life, you know and acting ... my mum (was) comfortable with her ...". Pupils describe the benefits of having a teacher whose friendliness helps transcend the boundaries between home and school.

A teacher's style of *relating* to pupils can be experienced in contradictory ways, for example Ellen described her positive experiences with Mrs. Morgan in affectionate tones. I said to Ellen and Katy "Mrs. Morgan leans on you I noticed (...)" Ellen interrupted me "Yeah [in a very soft affectionate tones] I continued " ... she makes contact ... she like leans on you (...)" Ellen experienced Mrs. Morgan as a person sensitive to the different needs of pupils. Ellen said " ... she kind of knows when you don't like it cos she's (...)" Katy made an affirmative noise. Ellen went on "... she's the kind of teacher that knows when you don't like cos ... she wouldn't do it to (...)" Not all pupils responded well to Mrs Morgan, Katy quickly said "Oh. She did that to Susan and Susan was ... oh afterwards ... she didn't like it (...). Mrs. Morgan's style of *teaching* was not generally called into question.²⁵⁰

A teacher's capacity to create and maintain order in a class is perceived as associated with having a 'good' style of teaching. Ellen and Katy referred to Mrs. Morgan as an example of a 'good' teacher. Both girls thought a 'good' teacher keeps 'control' of a class by presenting work clearly and in an interesting way. Mrs.

²⁵⁰ Katy, who was about to go into Mrs. Morgan's class, found the research interview to be an opportunity to hear more about Mrs. Morgan; how she related to pupils and how she performed as a teacher. This insight indicates the limits of isolating an interview as a 'snapshot of reality'; 'reality' is characteristically emergent, a continual process of constructing and deconstructing meanings.

Morgan was described as a 'good' teacher because she taught her subject clearly and was often entertaining in her presentation of the subject. Ellen and Katy contrasted Mrs. Morgan with another female teacher who was not considered a 'good' teacher. Her teaching was described as unclear and it was suggested that as a result boys in the class misbehaved. Katy said " ... Now if they were in Mrs. Morgan's class ... she would just stop that ... its just because ... they don't know what to do at all."

Pupils reported a teacher's capacity to ability to keep classroom social dynamics under control engendered pupils' respect, which enhanced the teaching and learning in the class. Matthew, for example said "With Miss Milligan it is ... she's very strict." I asked "Right. So tell me what you mean by that. How does she make it strict?" Matthew said "She doesn't let you talk. She makes you get on with your work" I asked "How does she do that?" Matthew said "She just ... you just do, you respect her, if you know what I mean. She's also quite ... she's a good teacher as well" I asked "What do you mean she teaches you (...)" Matthew interrupted, "Ahu, quite well. And you don't muck about because you just don't, you respect her."

Pupils argued teachers often try joking with pupils as a way of building positive relations among them. Whilst some teachers' jokes work other teachers do not seem able to 'pull off' a joke, which pupils explained by describing the teacher as having an 'off putting' personality. Ellen, for example described her registration teacher " ... If I had problems I would never go to my registration teacher. She just seems like a complete brick wall that you can't ... with no emotion, or anything, its as if she's got a machine gun under the desk when she's talking to you ... you kind of just do the formal things like giving your name if you're late, she'll put an L on it ... but if she jokes you have to laugh [chuckling and turning to Katy for affirmation] don't you?" Katy and Ellen laughed in mutual recognition that life in registration class ran more smoothly if they could manage a laugh in response to a non-funny joke.

Boys were more likely to describe a 'good' teacher as someone who is able to have a 'joke'. Tony gave an example of how jokes between boys in class were often partly reliant upon being able to 'draw in' a teacher in order to achieve what boys would define as a 'good joke'. Tony said "If you're just having a laugh *at* a teacher, the teacher will say something and you'll say it back and you'll just start laughing and he'll just start laughing and he'll say something back and you sit there and think 'oh well'." I asked Tony if by 'oh well' he meant he had "... better stop?" Tony said yes and went on to describe how such an interaction went badly wrong.

Tony explained "Aye but if you say it [the jokey comment] nastily, 9 times out of 10 you'll probably say it a lot quieter and you won't aim it at him unless you know that you're not going to get into trouble. He might say something like 'you never work' and you might turn around and say 'well you don't try and teach us'." I asked "Do you actually say that?" Tony replied "I've said that to a teacher once. He threw me out the classroom and I went back and apologised later." I asked "Did you mean what you said? Tony replied "I meant it but I didn't want to offend him because maybe he's not a good teacher but he probably tries as hard as he can." Tony's comment suggested an awareness that differences in teaching styles might be legitimate in that pupils have different educational needs. "It's just his way of teaching and maybe other people can work better to his way of teaching but I can't. So, I came back and said 'I'm really sorry, I said it on the spur of the moment'". Pupils provided many examples of boys as 'picked on' more frequently than girls, but as tolerated to a greater extent than girls arguably because they were good at 'jokes'. Rory was 'good' at joking, whilst Elliot had the 'cultural capital' to help mitigate some of the negative effects of 'annoying' a teacher .

Social outcomes of 'good' pupil/teacher relations enhance a teacher's personal and professional authority and status, which is reflected in his/her reputation, creates positive social resources of 'good' will and compassion that are drawn upon in negotiating times of 'trouble'. Social benefits are enhanced by female teachers licence to be kind and male teachers capacity to make good jokes.

- a 'bad' teacher

'Bad' pupil/teacher relations undermined a teacher's personal status and professional authority which was reflected in his/her reputation. A teacher who appears not to care about his/her pupils either personally or professionally is described by pupils as being a 'bad' teacher. Phillip's case illustrated the ongoing negative effects experienced by a pupil and his/her family of having a 'bad' teacher. Phillip's Mum was not able to talk to his teacher at a parents night about Phillip's 'bad' behaviour. The class teacher insisted the event was arranged to discuss academic work. Phillip's Mum's own experience at school had been very negative to the extent that she was really distressed when Phillip tried to tell her about what was happening to him at school. He chose to keep quiet at home so that his Mum

did not get upset.²⁵¹ Paul referred to Mr Alwin, a Maths teacher "Nah... he lets you do anything, he doesn't care." I said "Doesn't care?" Paul said "No." A 'bad' teacher is thought to demonstrate his/her not caring in how well prepared and able he/she is to teach his/her topic. Robin described Mr. Pinkman as a teacher who is always late; teachers who are late for class convey to pupils that they are not interested in their pupils. Tony, for example commented on Mr. Pinkman "I don't get on with Mr. Pinkman, at all ... Because I don't respect him as a teacher ... Mr. Pinkman is the type of teacher who will 'pick you out'." Tony described Mr. Pinkman as an example of a 'bad' teacher because Mr. Pinkman's method of controlling social interactions between pupils, described as 'picking on' a pupil, was considered by him and pupils in both schools as an unfair means for establishing and maintaining his control of the class.

Pupils perceived some teachers as viewing less academically 'able' pupils with less respect and value in comparison to 'swots' and/or socially competent pupils and Mr Pinkman was given as an example of that kind of teacher. I observed such treatment of Jo a pupil Mr Pinkman later described as "Oh, she has a 'behaviour' problem." The dynamic between him and Jo began as soon as he entered the classroom. Space does not allow a full description of this class, but boys whom I had witnessed 'acting up' in other classes did not challenge Mr Pinkman, whilst Jo appeared to respond to Mr Pinkman's challenge that she "act by my rules". Whilst pupils witnessed the teacher's attempted humiliation of Jo in a series of interactions between teacher and pupil, they did their school work in relatively strict silence, which Mr. Pinkman demanded.

Everyday pupil/teacher relations

Typically in full view of a class, teachers perceived as largely interested in getting 'school work' done are forced to refer to formal codes of conduct in attempts to establish 'formal order'. Data has shown how coercive relations tend to be confrontational rather than co-operative relations especially among male pupils. Such teachers ignore social norms and emotional work constitutive of everyday interaction. Heritage paraphrases Garfinkel to write,

²⁵¹ The research did not extend to include an analysis of pupils' views of parents, but, boys largely talked about their relationship with their mothers in terms of taking care not to upset them, whereas girls accounts of relationships with their mothers revealed a more combative relationship around the issue of boys and potential sexual relations.

Social norms provide a way of understanding and accounting for the normal way that a scene develops and for making visible other courses of action that are taken. Whatever the outcome of the 'choice' ... the availability of the norm will provide a means by which the conduct and its circumstances can be rendered sensible, describable and accountable" (Heritage 1984: 108).

In reaching agreement about 'incidents' involving some adjudication of blame everyday rules of gendered interaction and formal rules of organisation and practises are brought together as mutually constitutive (Heritage 1984: 107- 109). Conventional accounts of in/discipline in classrooms draw upon 'deviance' to conceptualise 'discipline' as 'control' to be *applied* by recourse to codes of conduct, sanctions and punishments (Munn and Lloyd 1998).²⁵²

Codes of conduct structure a discourse of 'bureaucratic order' in which pupils are categorised and assessed in terms of 'attendance', 'behaviour' and 'performance'. Conventional accounts that draw upon organisational categories, reflect schooling as it 'ought to be' organised and practised. Pupils' accounts constructed in terms of 'communicative action' reflect schooling as it 'is' experienced.²⁵³ As different kinds of arguments 'is' and 'ought' discourses do not fit easily together. Silver writes, "The modern friendship ideal aspires towards forms of conduct profoundly different from those of the institutionalised order (1989: 275). Munn notes official and professional concern for the curriculum as overshadowing changing demands upon pupil-teacher relations (Munn 1999: 406 -414). Official recognition of schools as social institutions are implicit in suggestions that schools evaluate themselves, albeit through 'performance' indicators (MacBeath 1999).²⁵⁴ Pupils' accounts show

²⁵² Munn and Lloyd's (1998) *Discipline in Schools: A review of extent, causes and cures*. is a review of educational literature that reveals the problem of Exclusion to be theoretically dominated by psychological accounts of 'indiscipline', that are explicitly positivistic in their approach.

²⁵³ See Hanna F. Pitkin, *Wittgenstein and Justice* (1972: 177 -178) for a linguistic philosopher's view about the 'is' and the 'ought'. Pitken writes, "The conventional wisdom of contemporary political science offers us a loud, clear answer as to the nature of Socrates and Thrasymachus' quarrel [about the meaning and use of 'justice']: the latter is concerned with what is, the former with what ought to be". Citing Dahl who writes, the two were talking past each other "... because Socrates was making a *normative* argument, Thrasymachus an *empirical* one" (Robert Dahl, *Modern Political Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall (1963: 65).

²⁵⁴ See MacBeath (1999) whose discussion refers to research into self- evaluation by schools through the use of 'performance indicators'. The *process of 'self-evaluation'* provided *members of schools* with the opportunity to be reflexive about their organisation and practises that constituted their school and the schooling it provided for pupils.

positive learning and teaching relations and successful academic outcomes as emerging from within co-operative relations characteristic of friendship and suggest codes of conduct are understood as *guides* to how people *ought* to act at school.

Pupils' accounts show the degree to which 'sanctions' are used influences the extent of a youngster's formal and social exclusion, that is exclusion from participation to the same degree as his/her peers in the social production and reproduction of resources at school. A 'sanction' has a social effect of 'holding' a pupil in 'time'; that is, a 'sanction' holds up the possibility of a pupil participating in ongoing interaction in the same terms and conditions enjoyed by his/her peers. The 'sanction' of sending a pupil out of the classroom excludes the sanctioned pupil from formal learning and teaching that takes place whilst he/she is out of the classroom. Or the 'sanction' of detention during social time excludes the pupil from participation in social interactions that take place in social time.

Pupils' accounts suggest in/discipline is experienced as degrees of dis/order. Teachers' use of sanctions and punishments largely show them as failing to create positive resources between pupils and teacher, for example if their 'application' is considered to be unfair. With respect to gender, Jamieson notes from 1900 to 1930, "The most commonly remembered differences in the treatment and behaviour of boys and girls in school involved discipline and insurrection (Jamieson 1990; 20).²⁵⁵ Wolpe cites an early body of feminist literature addressing girls limited access to education writing, "Such work claims that boys behaviour is the major cause of the apparent failure of girls to achieve in school" (Wolpe 1988: 19).²⁵⁶ Pupils accounts' show a persistence in a relationship between boys and 'bad' behaviour relative to girls they explained in reference to social acceptance of boys as related to a socially necessary quality 'hardness' that boys expect of each other. Termed as 'swotting', action necessary for academic success is a socially denigrated action, although less so for girls. Pupils' gendered 'discursive practises' linked 'pupil-controlled disorder' with 'teacher-controlled order', for example 'slagging' and 'stirring' about 'swotting' are matters that a teacher might rebuke a pupil about (Woods 1983: 20). Gender

²⁵⁵ See Jamieson (1990: 16 - 37) for an historical account of gender differences and similarities in the schooling of working-class children circa 1900 - 1930.

²⁵⁶ Wolpe cites Dale Spender (1982) *Invisible Women: the schooling scandal*. London, Writers and Readers Cooperative; Gaby Weiner, (1985) (eds.) *Just a Bunch of Girls*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

places an added spin upon the contradiction of pupils having to "stick up for yourself" and "... get known" at school without gaining a negative reputation. The exercise of sanctions and punishments at school effectively contributed largely to negative labelling of teachers and pupils, particularly boys in terms of a 'bad' reputation.²⁵⁷ Educational experience emerges as significantly social in character. Issues of 'deviance' and 'control' are continually negotiated among gendered actors as rule following from which 'discipline' emerges as a characteristic of relations among pupils *and* teachers.

Summary

This chapter has continued with the theme of 'communicative action' by describing 'discursive practices' of 'moaning', 'grassing' and 'radging' to show the on-going character of problem solving among pupils and teachers as they engage in everyday demands of schooling. Chapter Six presents pupils concepts 'talking it through' and 'fighting it out', to argue that these reflect the 'gender order' of everyday interactions. Problems of preserving face in formal settings, particularly in times of 'trouble', is precisely because schooling is largely conducted in **public** view of a range of social audiences. Boys are socially controlled by a desire to keep 'face' first and foremost with other boys. Girls are socially controlled by a desire to keep 'face' with girls and boys and do so by keeping within a more limited gendered licence to be noisy. The chapter argues that in these conditions, dis/agreements among pupils in class or between a teacher and pupil are publicly constrained and conducted in the language of school rules.

Pupils' accounts' and my own observations suggest gendered ideas shape the way boys in comparison to girls express themselves at school, which impacts differentially on school work. Boys are expected by other boys to act sufficiently 'hard', whilst girls are expected to act in a ways that are closer to an academic ideal.

²⁵⁷ Special sessions for 'targeted pupils' were a topic of conversation among pupils and teachers in both schools. In Town School, for example, a class specially convened to address problems of some boys in the school became known as, the 'bad' boys class, which was abandoned because boys competed to be the best at being 'hardest'! The boys had no real expectation of achievement in 'academic' terms. In contrast, for a short period City School focused on girls thought to be vulnerable to Exclusion, but, who were thought to have 'academic' potential. Discussions were about general issues rather than about particular incidences that had to be defended. The 'project', which cannot be described in more detail for reasons of anonymity, had positive effects for some girls. One girl considered participation in the project gave girls a chance to express negative as well as positive feelings about their teachers in a situation of relative privacy.

Action at school is discursively accounted for according to gendered norms, for example a girl who acts in a noisy and confrontational way can expect to lose her 'good' reputation more quickly than a boy. In times of relational stress, girls are more likely to withdraw from that situation, which in classrooms means they will become 'quiet' or 'skive'. As Chapter One notes, teachers show the quiet child less attention (Woods 1990b: 59 -60).²⁵⁸ In comparison, boys are socially expected to express themselves more loudly than girls, which in classrooms means boys who express dis/agreement with other boys or a teacher, are more likely to be subject to formal attention, which becomes a matter of public accounting (Askew and Ross 1988)²⁵⁹.

In the absence of mutually created positive social resources, teachers are forced to make greater reference to codes of conduct and use sanctions and punishments as way of forcing pupils to conform with the demands of schooling. The degree to which a teacher asserts school rules and threatens pupils with the possibility of sanctions or punishments as a way of securing formal order is arguably reflected in the character of formal relations within a class. Pupils nevertheless, largely recognise and accept the rightful authority of teachers in their attempts to teach the curriculum. Pupils' accounts show the formal demands of schooling limit teachers **time** to the extent that 'talking through' problems that pupils bring into class or that arise in class, is largely impossible, which leads pupils to criticise some teachers for what is experienced as unfair treatment of or lack of interest in pupils as people.

Albeit constrained within formal conditions, pupils' acts of in/discipline create a dynamic tension of control/deviance in class, which the thesis argues are necessarily negotiated. Data shows pupils come together in 'classes', with particular social dynamics, in which they and their teachers discursively produce co-operative resources necessary for learning and teaching in a mass context. Pupils' accounts show that extending and receiving respect among pupils and teachers is a two way affair, and that positive relations among them rely upon mutual 'respect' and 'trust', and hopefully with 'liking'. On the one hand, 'good' times create positive social

²⁵⁸ Woods (1990b) notes positive interpretations of quietness among girls, to challenge the idea that a 'quiet girl' is necessarily 'weak' in comparison to boys defined as 'strong', due to their more overt approaches to the problems they encounter at school.

²⁵⁹ Askew and Ross (1988: 17) distinguish between aggression/violence among boys and an ability to express anger assertively and positively over personal and political issues.

resources that enable teachers and pupils to co-operate with each other in the formal demands of schooling. On the other hand, 'bad' times compound 'bad' feelings and strain people's capacity and willingness to co-operate with formal demands of schooling. Pupils accounts show that having a teacher who treats them consistency contributes positively to the creation of 'good' formal relations and visa versa. It is from within the negotiated aspect of everyday interactions that 'discipline' emerges as a social phenomenon, that is 'more than the sum of its parts'.

Chapter Eight

Teachers' views on in/discipline at school

a wee stone can turn into a massive mountain

Introduction

Chapter Eight draws upon teachers' accounts of their experience of teaching in Town School and City School, which were reflected upon in the context of wider teaching experiences, largely in Scottish secondary schools.²⁶⁰ The chapter defines a teacher/pupil relation as normatively negotiated within official aims and purposes of education, articulated as "Achievement for all" (SOEID 1996).²⁶¹ The chapter examines teachers' normative understandings of teaching as reflected in the character of everyday encounters within formal relations. Teachers defined, their work as 'teaching pupils' and themselves as professionals whose everyday concerns related to primarily to professional tasks associated with preparing and delivering lessons. Teachers argue successful teaching and learning outcomes are shaped by the 'quality' of teacher/pupil relations. Teachers' accounts reveal normative interpretation and responses to pupils' acts of in/discipline, significantly shaped by stereotypical understandings of 'gender'. As central to achieving formal order, these

²⁶⁰Chapter Four discusses formal aspects of schooling in Scottish secondary schools.

²⁶¹ Organising pupils into classes, constrained within limited material and professional resources creates problems of reconciling misfits between provision of education for the number of pupils with academic or social problems, according to a principle of 'equality of opportunity'. Circular No 10/96 'Achievement for All': *A Report on Selection Within Schools* by HM Inspectors of Schools, which notes key principles for learning. The report exhorts teachers to "... promote teaching which builds on the prior learning and attainments of pupils", implicitly referring to 'constructionism' as an approach to learning and teaching (Bryce 1996). An exhortation at odds with Circular No 5/98 (SOEID 1998) *Reporting On School Performance Against Targets For Improving In Standard and Higher Grade Attainment*, which in reference to a government report, 'Setting Targets - Raising Standards in Schools' (4 March 1998) argues for selection of pupils within 'attainment groups'. The report's suggestions arguably begin to unpick 'comprehensive education' as based upon a principle of 'mixed ability' teaching. The principle of 'mixed ability' teaching, contrasts with a principle of 'setting' on the grounds of 'academic ability'. The former is argued to reflect a spirit of educational inclusion, whilst the latter arguably reflects an acceptance of exclusion of 'less able' pupils, who traditionally have not been provided with a curriculum appropriate to their educational needs.

forms of interpretation shape formal relations at school, which necessarily involve problems of achieving mutually acceptable levels of school work. Drawing upon data, the chapter characterises teacher/pupil relations as negotiated in interaction, in which social resources, from co-operation to coercion, are both created and drawn upon. Teacher/learner relations of a coercive character emerge as more likely to lead to exclusion of pupils from classrooms, the assignment of a 'bad' reputation and ultimately to Exclusion.

Teaching and collegiality

Teachers described successful schooling as based upon a general principle of support and trust among colleagues. Teachers' accounts stressed 'team work' and 'co-operation' among teachers as a necessary condition for personal and professional survival at school. Most teachers commented upon 'presentation of self' to pupils, and its significance in underpinning a teacher's professional authority. Teachers described teaching as a daily performance in front of pupils, for example

Guidance teacher: ... You have to give a performance ... pupils can go for the jugular, if there is a little chink in your armour ... all you have to face the class is your personality ... that's all you have really.

Teacher described having confidence in 'self' and their teaching materials as contributing to successful teaching. Teachers distinguished between teachers, in the same way as pupils, describing colleagues as 'good' and 'bad' and, by implication, 'sad'. Teachers linked style of teaching with having a capacity to maintain good order in a classroom, to say generally colleagues who lacked good 'personal but professional' rapport with pupils and/or who were poorly prepared, were frequently forced to assert codified rules to maintain formal order. Teachers reported frequent assertion of codified rules exacerbated tensions within the class, and that pupils felt that this practice suggested a teacher was not in control of 'self', yet alone the process of teaching and pupils learning. In these contexts, when a pupil 'acted out' (see below) matters could spiral dramatically out of order.

Whilst both schools had formal statements of school rules, at City School, recent attempts to address in/discipline had led to their display in every teaching area, together with a set of graded sanctions. The statement outlined official responses a pupil could expect if he/she broke a school rule. This formulation reflected official expectations that in times of dispute teachers and pupils could/would interact in a

measured/rational way, as 'discipline' involved following a process. A pupil receiving a verbal chastisement, followed by a sanction, for example to sit at another desk, from the class teacher; should the pupil fail to co-operate, the class teacher could call upon a principle teacher, who would go through the same process, in which the sanction might be to go to another classroom. If a pupil continued to refuse to co-operate with requests, the principle teacher could call upon a deputy head with responsibility for discipline. Ultimately the trajectory for a pupil who failed to co-operate with this staged approach was Exclusion.

Teachers in both schools referred to 'consistency of approach' to pupils as a norm for teaching/learning. Teachers reported, consistent treatment of pupils created important social and personal resources; a teacher's authority and his/her respect among pupils.

Mr Pinkman: Authority you can project and respect comes from pupils over a period of time ... you can't actually insist on respect but you can assert authority ... respect is to do with consistency ... it is to do with fairness.

Mrs Morgan comes to mind as a teacher who characterised a 'good' teacher by teachers standards, as a larger than life character, full of energy and apparent educational purpose; when she entered a classroom a ripple of energy and purpose flowed around the room. Her request to one young girl to put her " ... chewing gum in the bin please!"²⁶² effectively conveying to the class, we were here to work, work we would. And work we did! The lesson was fascinating, an immensely interesting learning experience for me, **and** apparently for the pupils.

Many teachers referred to respect, built up over time, as a positive social resource drawn upon in stressful times, " ... You're building up the respect of the youngsters". Teachers argued, fair treatment of pupils relied upon 'consistency of practice' as reflected in teachers observation of school rules. Teachers acknowledged some colleagues did not observe school rules, for example in allowing casual use of a Sony Walkman and in 'turning a blind eye' to gum chewing and obvious social chat

²⁶² I was noting the gendered character of seating arrangements at the time, and 'automatically obeyed' her request by swallowing my chewing gum!

in class. A number of teachers were critical of such colleagues arguing their in/action amounted to breaking of professional trust among teachers.

Although all teachers accepted 'yuffty' teaching as a necessary act of collegiality, 'yuffty' teaching was reported to show teachers' weaknesses, particularly of teachers pupils defined as 'bad' and/or 'sad'.

Mr Fineman: 'Yuffty' teaching you go in ... its like grrr .. you don't know anybody and they don't know you and they'll just push ... now [*after a number of years teaching at City School*] it is not so bad because often I go into do a 'yuffty' I know people in the classroom and immediately you've got that advantage ... hey I know you come on ... you can divert them from their chatting and finding out what work they should be doing and that is often all that is needed to get them going.

One guidance teacher offered a positive comment about 'yuffty' teaching; he enjoyed the opportunity to see how his 'old' pupils were getting on. As described in Chapter Seven, teachers generally expect to do their own work, for example an AHT at City School said, "I can do a massive amount of admin, because the class just get their heads down and work".²⁶³ The AHT qualified this point; "if staff ... are on the second period ... the class have exhausted the work and feel exhausted themselves ... they say they have nothing to do ... there is a potential discipline issue there".²⁶⁴ Teachers reported that eighty minutes without any 'real' teaching, spent with pupils they did not 'know', created a custodial relation between teacher and pupils. Comparing my observations of 'normal' and 'yuffty' classes showed that 'yuffty' teachers made greater reference to 'taken for granted' codes of conduct as a basis for restoring formal order, for example teachers' ritual command of pupils to 'stop talking'.²⁶⁵ Teachers' views over this point corresponded with pupils' views, to

²⁶³ A 'yuffty' class takes place at short notice, therefore, work set by the absent subject teacher, or the head of the subject department, was described as often not really appropriate.

²⁶⁴ A 'yuffty' class often has one teacher for the first period and another for the second period.

²⁶⁵ See for example, Hargreaves *et al.* (1967) who write about kinds of rules, that govern the classroom and formal requirements that teachers regularly make of pupils. Categorized as, 'what is going on' and 'what the teacher means' authors give the example of eight statements that are considered to mean 'pay attention to me' a meaning that is argued to be clear because all were uttered in the same kind of 'context'. Similarly the authors gave five

suggest that *mutual* engagement in teaching/learning is necessary to achieve 'institutional order' in classrooms.

Serious acts of in/discipline and gender

Aggressive action that threatens pupils or teachers leads to Exclusion. All teachers considered decisions to Exclude a pupil as a matter for senior management. Pupils were described as Excluded from school in two main ways: as a dramatic event that everyone talked about, for example when a teacher is told to "fuck off"; as a process, for example a pupil who through continual use of 'conduct sheets', ultimate referral to the School Liaison Group, and an inability to co-operate with strategies offered by the SLG.

In reference to pupils who get into **serious trouble**, that is, a pupil's **non-co-operation** with teachers' requests, or serious disregard for the safety of others,²⁶⁶ teachers made the same statement again and again; **what** boys and girls do is the same, that is, it is the **character of aggression**, or a pupil's complete defiance of a teachers request to do something that triggers Exclusion. Some pupils are well known for this kind of 'behaviour' in all classes.

Mrs Day: But some kids are creating a rumpus in all classes even where the class is well controlled ... the kid either has huge problems or is just a 'bad' bugger.

Mrs Day gave examples of 'serious trouble' as, swearing at teachers, making 'fuck off' signs to a teacher, throwing things, repeatedly refusing to co-operate with a teacher's instructions, for example by saying "I'm no daeing it!"

Mrs Day: It sounds pretty petty but the whole class is aware of the person, he/she takes over the whole classroom and a teacher is overjoyed if the boy/girl is truanting or is not in. The relief is enormous .

Mrs Day's appraisal of pupils, generally in terms how well she knew them as people and of how well they did their school work, described boys and girls as acting in the

examples of the statement 'stop talking' to show how in different contexts the same words conveyed different meanings to pupils; ranging from no cheating, don't interrupt, get on with your work, don't be impolite, and don't disturb other pupils (1975: 63-64).

²⁶⁶ C. Parsons (1999: 61) includes inappropriate sexual behaviour.

same way. But, went on to explain Exclusion in terms of human nature: "... there are less Excluded girls because girls by nature are less aggressive than boys."

Mrs Day's description reflected a common differentiation of boys and girls in terms of forms of aggression,

Mrs Day: Girls do the same things as boys but are far more subtle ... boys who are Excluded from school are largely violent or antisocial ... bottom line girls are not as physically aggressive and violent as boys but when you do have a physically aggressive and violent girl she is as bad and if not worse than boys.

Many teachers men and women, for example judged a 'bad' girl as worse than a 'bad' boy, for example

Mrs Day: Sometimes girls take things ... a stage further ... they will not let thing go ... it's like a pit bull terrier ... they will not shake it off. Sometimes boys will come to a halt and the girls just seem to go on and on.

Mr Coleman's stated, "No difference in boys and girls, same crimes same modus operandi", but qualified this to say girls are more mature than boys of the same age. Mr Coleman, and every other teacher I interviewed, differentiated between boys and girls 'behaviour' in terms of gender stereotypes, but rejected 'gender' as constitutive of Exclusion.

A senior teacher, with wide experience of the forms and processes of Exclusion brought up the topic of weak teachers and professional difficulties raised in trying to negotiate around a loss of control by teachers in situations that could be very stressful and frightening for teacher and pupil (Munn *et al.* 2000: 12). Mrs Day, for example referred to incidences of violence noted to occur within interactions between a boy with **particular** teachers,

Mrs Day: I have never felt frightened with aggressive boys but I could well understand how some teachers could irritate the kids so much that the kid would hit out.

Such a boy was thought of as able to work with and tolerated by other colleagues. In a context of privacy, guidance teachers described some colleagues as unable to do what, in their experience, pupils will do,

Mrs McGuin: ... they'll normally come round to it when they've done something wrong but teachers [*measured pause*] don't usually [*said with emphasis*] ... they need to say "I'm really sorry" but most people think that if they do that they are loosing face.

Despite expectations that 'school relations' be conducted according to official rules and regulations, a senior teacher specifically mentioned outcomes for some pupils are negatively shaped by the fact that a teacher and pupil "... just do not like each other".

A brief examination of an official record of Exclusions at City School, showed that across one year, forty pupils were Excluded, thirty five of whom were boys.²⁶⁷ Teachers' contradictory statements about gender and Exclusion, for example that 'boys and girls act the same', that 'girls are naturally less aggressive' and that 'girls' behaviour' is worse than boys', evident within and between schools, requires explanation.

Social inequality and education

Chapter One highlights the coercive character of 'school relations'; whilst pupils **may or may not want** education, the law **obliges** parent/s to make sure children attend school, justified in terms of 'equality of opportunity'. Giddens has suggested, "... education tends to express and reaffirm existing inequalities far more than it acts to change them" (Giddens 1989: 423). Bourdieu's 'theory in practice' offers a concept of 'cultural capital' to explain education's reproduction of social inequality (Bourdieu & Passeron 1990), Social inequality remains current in the social stratification of British society along class lines (Ball *et al.* 1994; Brown & Riddell 1992). Brown *et al.*, and Ball *et al.*, note other forms of inequality, such as sexism and racism, as interacting in ill understood ways with class, to produce new forms of social disadvantage. Tomlinson exemplifies authors who have identified

²⁶⁷ On request to see an example of such a record, material was prepared for me (with pupils names expunged), so that I could see for my self what kinds of information such a record held. The record's categories allowed for noting a pupil's sex; year of course; number of days Excluded; reason (brief statements were noted, for example, 'assault on another pupil); meeting held with parent; number of previous Exclusions, broken down by short term (*temporary*) and Formal (*permanent*) and within those categories, by 'this quarter' and 'previously'. See Chapter One where I discuss problems of official recording of Exclusion, to note that whilst all schools are expected to keep records of individual Exclusion, the character of information officially recorded is too limited for explanatory purposes.

discriminatory patterns of schooling on the basis of class, gender and more recently, race and ethnicity (Tomlinson 1982). Gray, McPherson and Raffe (1983) noted links between poverty and educational under achievement; numerous authors refer to a continuity of this link (Boyd 1999; Clark 1997; Munn 1999), which adds weight to arguments that education serves the needs of capital more surely than the needs of citizens (Brown 1987).

Sociology of education has theorised persistent social inequality in society as polarised dichotomies of micro v macro, or structure v agency, drawing largely upon the concepts of 'power' and 'resistance' (Willis 1977; Woods 1983 ; Giddens 1957, 1984). Ball argues sociological debate in education has attended to "... technical aspects of schooling ... or ... focused on conflict between pupils and teachers in the classroom (Ball 1987: 2). Earlier interactionists' accounts focused on 'deviance' in schools, for example Hargreaves, Hestor and Mellor wrote, "... [we] made no great 'discoveries' about classroom deviance", and by generating "... a more adequate a conceptual framework [aimed to] contribute to the theory of deviance" (Hargreaves *et al*, 1975: Preface). Following Hargreaves, Tattum's interactionist research with 'disruptive pupils' also analysed acts of in/discipline as 'behavioural' problems, using the concept of 'deviance' to explicitly address rules at school (Tattum 1982: 157-163). Tattum argues, two major elements define what generally constitutes a 'violent' act, and more specifically for his study, what constitutes a 'disruptive act'; "... namely, the social context in which the act takes place, and the power of the observer to define it as illegitimate" (Tattum 1982: 4). Hargreaves *et al*. and Tattum noted an *ad hoc* character of rule interpretation in the practise of teachers, but did not ask the question 'what is a rule?' (Hargreaves *et al*. 1975: 63-64; Tattum 1982). Authors links with 'deviance' suggest their social inquiry as constrained within the concept of 'deviance' 'as a 'thing in itself', rather than as Durkheim would argue, a normal necessary aspect of process whereby a 'moral society' is continuously constituted. In asking 'what is a rule?' the discursive basis of social structure as 'negotiated order' is revealed; interaction is characterised by rule following and rule making among social actors (Bloor 1997: see Chapter Three). Woods discussed 'negotiation' to argue, "Where the norms and rules are constructed in interaction, they are of the essence"(Woods 1983: 127). Constrained within official rules or statements of how actor's 'ought to act', Schooling is structured by rules, which Strauss *et al* define as a 'negotiated order': rules are either formal (codified laws) or

informal (tacit agreements)(Strauss 1964).²⁶⁸ The sections that follow attempt to identify the normative referents actors use in attributing meaning to action.

A teachers job is to teach

Teachers defined their professional obligations as, "the job of a teacher is to teach and the job of a pupil is to learn" (Woods 1990a:121-144).²⁶⁹ Teachers endorsed official aims and purposes of education, officially articulated as "Achievement for all", via national guidelines on the curriculum and public examinations.²⁷⁰ Teachers expressed doubts and concerns about the adequacy of existing curriculum, associating it with problems in meeting educational needs of *all* children in a class (Ozga 1988).²⁷¹ Some pupils for example are provided with learning materials from which they cannot be expected to learn. I quote a class teacher,

²⁶⁸ Wittgenstein would disagree with Struass and would not use terms like 'vague' or 'ambiguous' to define a rule, for Wittgenstein, a rule is formally defined and is a rule, but, the socially negotiated character of rules is reflected in Wittgenstein's, "And hence also 'obeying a rule' is a practice. And to *think* one is obeying a rule is not to obey a rule. Hence it is not possible to obey a rule 'privately': otherwise thinking one was obeying a rule would be the same thing as obeying it." Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations* . (1968, Part 1, 202). Translated by G.E.M. Anscombe Basil Blackwell: Oxford.

²⁶⁹ See Woods (1990a), whose text addresses teachers' management of increases in 'stress' experienced at work, arguably as an outcome of recommendations arising out of The Education Reform Act (1988). Drawing upon the tradition of Lacey (1977); Hammersley (1977); Hargreaves A., (1977, 1978 and 1979); Pollard (1982); Woods (1979 & 1980); Denscombe (1985), Woods argues for an analysis of teachers' work through the concept of 'strategy' as, " ... a way of getting to the heart of school action ... [and a] ... consideration of the influence of both structure generated constraints and of individual biography (1990a: 121). However, Claire Wallace, (1993) in *Debates in Sociology*: 94-117, discusses the concept of 'strategy', in which Wallace notes Crow's (1989) description of seventeen different meanings associated with 'strategy'.

²⁷⁰ See Chapter One, where justification of compulsory state education is mediated in terms of a right of a citizen in modernity to education based upon a principle of 'equality of opportunity', albeit qualified in terms of 'potential to benefit'. In current 'market conditions' characterised by a pronounced linking of material and professional resources in mainstream schools in relation to pupil and teacher 'performance', the 'quality' of alternative education is assessed in reference to a range of 'principles', 'models' and 'mixed messages', to suggest policy makers have 'forgotten' the 'deal', and act pragmatically regarding provision of education. For discussions on the form and 'quality' of alternative education, see C. Parsons (1999: 122-123) and J. Normington (1996: 237 -249).

²⁷¹ See (Lawn and Ozga 1988: 81 -98) for a sociological treatment of current concerns for teachers who experience increasing deskilling, 'burnout' and stress, which represents a re-emergence of a Marxist analysis of the logic of capitalism. Mac an Ghail (1994) argues examples from his data supports Ozga's argument that teachers are being demoted from

Mr Kyte: We deliver a curriculum riddled with time wasting and inappropriate material for both boys and girls. We don't have lots of choice or lots of time but in the time that we have I believe that what has developed to be the accepted curriculum is certainly inappropriate for today's world.

Some teachers, in both schools, expressed these views. Mr Coleman's comments typified teachers' views of a distinctive pupil agenda about school work, differentiated along three dimensions; what they like to do; what they have to do and what they should be doing. Graphically described as, "... the lights are on, but nobody is at home", Mr Coleman's comment reflects an impression of some pupils as present in body, but not in mind. As the preceding chapters have shown social matters are taken very seriously by pupils; Mr Dawson, reflected upon his experience of guidance at City School to note, discussion among pupils are more extensive than in the past and, "They do not leave them at the door." Teachers say significant numbers of pupils do not see school work as relevant in relation to the world that pupils will have to enter as adults. Some teachers accept this view as a fair evaluation by pupils (Parsons 1999: 51).

Teachers' notions of pupil 'maturity'

Built into teachers' aspirations of the kinds of pupils they would like to teach, is the norm of 'mature' pupil, characteristically described by teachers, as those who come to school prepared for and willing to accept academic discipline that requires focused concentration upon a range of subjects (Hargreaves *et al.* 1975; Keddie 1971; Rosenthal & Jacobson 1968). A 'mature' pupil, for example is described by,

Mr Coleman: ... as able to act responsibly, to think for themselves, to organise themselves reasonably well, to be honest, to think before doing, to work with a *greater maturity that doesn't come at primary seven* (my italics).

Pupils are expected to act co-operatively at all times of the day; in and out of class. Teachers have a high expectation that pupils act with 'maturity'. A pupil's capacity to do school work rest upon an assumption that he/she can read, write, understand numbers and increasingly be able to use computers in order to find out information, rather than for pleasure. Teachers described daily dis/agreements between them

professional teacher to facilitator, for example, a national curriculum is understood as an increasing control of classroom practice by government.

and pupils over failure to get school work done, as a persistent 'drip drip' of annoyance.

Teachers recognise and expect that within a year group pupils will be differentiated by degrees of 'maturation'.

Mr Kyte: ... we do squeeze young people into, however caring or pupil centered we are, we have to squeeze them into the ways of the institution and we have to consider the other twenty nine and it doesn't suit everyone ... it doesn't suit everyone such a range of development in maturation levels alone a range of variation psychologically and physiologically as much as four years of variation in a class

Among teachers in both schools, the idea of 'maturity' is used as code for describing those pupils who co-operate with the formal demands of schooling; that pupils, to do their school work, as, when, where and with whom the school decides. A pupil's failure to conform with formal demands at school is often explained by teachers in terms of lack of 'maturity', which was naturally attributed to boys relative to girls. Mr Coleman, was typical of teachers who thought of 'maturation' changes among pupils as **imposed** by a school. Data show teachers' views of a pupil's 'maturity' emerge from gendered interactions among actors linked by mutual need of social acceptance and formal competence.

Definitions of in/discipline

Teachers descriptions of in/discipline show 'behaviour' is interpreted in two ways; in reference to formal rules or codes of conduct, where meaning is 'taken for granted' as fixed, *and*, in reference to social norms that govern everyday interaction, where by definition meaning is negotiated. An Assistant Head Teacher (AHT) at Town School said,

AHT: Youngsters experience difficulties in setting norms of behaviour we expect of them and difficulties in relationships with peers and teachers.

Teachers in both schools defined in/discipline at school as pupil action which strains the **tolerance** of those around them, action characterised as 'unacceptable' to pupils and teachers alike.

Mr Pinkman: Pupils complain about bad behaviour.....
 I imagine a similarity of view among pupils, those who
 don't cause a discipline problem, and staff, about
 unacceptable behaviour cos most don't get involved in
 any kind of in discipline and want to learn and don't
 like being disrupted.

Clearly, levels of tolerance towards 'unacceptable' pupil action vary from one person to the next, and according to how people feel at the time.

Teachers initially responded to my request for a description of 'unacceptable' pupil 'behaviours' with a 'list' of examples. The list made no real sense unless he/she described the context in which pupil action took place. Thus 'behaviour', a key educational category, is not adequate to account for 'action' and interaction within social relations at school as formal categories are not indexical in character.

Interpretive work done by teachers in interactions constitutive of practice were evident in their statements, which defined 'bad' behaviour, as 'non-serious', 'tending towards serious' and as 'serious'.

Very few teachers explicitly talked about learning and teaching as a social relation. At City School, for example Mrs McNab's placement of the worth of a curriculum as directly constituted in teacher/learner relations was rare.

Mrs McNab: ... a curriculum is only the vehicle, it
 (learning) is all about relationships.²⁷²

Later the point was reiterated as linked to academic attainment,

Mrs McNab: Successful schooling is an outcome of
 'good' relationships

Teachers stressed, for example a pupil's 'behaviour' often arises from significant relational problems, which may adversely affect learning. Teachers in both schools acknowledged that pupil 'action', described as 'bad' behaviour, was **not necessarily**

²⁷² Her words, almost word for word, echoed a comment made by an AHT in an interview I had carried out at a special unit for pupils with 'sebd'. It transpired that the AHT and this teacher had both attended a course at the Institute of Human Relations, run jointly between them and the University of Edinburgh. A key outcome for participants in that course was an understanding of the character and effects of loss in human lives; that is the ways in which people form emotional attachments and cope with loss, either of having not made 'positive attachments' or the loss of 'positive attachments' due to death, or social separation.

a feature of all of a pupil's formal interactions. Just as 'good' relations are seen as a key to academic success, so 'bad' relations were implicated in lack of academic success.

Problems of 'immaturity' or in/discipline emerge at the level of face-to-face interactions. A teacher's formal authority is **coercive**, as reflected in sanctions attached to 'codes of conduct' governing formal action. Teachers argued, successful teaching and learning emerges from **co-operative** relations, as reflected in actors references to teachers and pupils as 'bad'/'good'. Guidance teachers emphasised teachers must gain a pupil's trust as a prerequisite of co-operative relations, noting this process as time consuming. Nevertheless, social relations are normatively constituted; action within them is variously interpreted either in reference to rules or social norms.

Teachers described rules/sanctions formula as intended to set up a cycle of perceived threat towards pupils who failed to co-operate with class teachers.²⁷³ Some class teachers argued sanctions associated with codified rules were largely meaningless.

Class Teacher: The pupils in general do not see [the process] as any sort of a threat ... to have so many steps ... it took so long to get to the deputy head who gave the punishment exercise or detention ... the message came back to the pupils that nothing happened... You have to have a perceived threat because there is no 'real' threat ... as the Assistant Head says, "What can we do?"

After a short period of use, teachers reported using the bits of this formal process that seemed useful to them at the time. Pupils *and* teachers report differential treatment of pupils over similar acts of in/discipline in classrooms, justified in reference to school rules (Hargreaves *et al.* 1975). Actors characterised school rules as non-negotiable. Chapter Three presented rules as social institutions and meaning

²⁷³ Pupils described referring to the rules/sanctions in debates about fair treatment of pupils by teachers. In the event of a teacher making regular reference to this system, the teacher lost 'street cred' with pupils and became known as a 'sad' teacher. Pupils clearly did not believe the document represented any 'real threat', although some pupils wished that it did so that some of their peers could be better controlled by weaker teachers.

as necessarily negotiated in everyday practice to argue such a view cannot be valid (Woods 1990b: 1-3).

Everyday problems in class

Pupils problems arise or become evident to a class teacher. Mr Pinkman, for example described a common dilemma for all teachers; when and where is the right time to address a problem with a pupil? Mr Pinkman thought the best time to talk about a problem, was as soon as possible, preferably after class, but generally the moment was lost. In his experience, his request to a pupil to 'stay behind' was overheard by others. In these conditions,

Mr Pinkman: You ask the question and you'll get an answer but it will be a monosyllabic answer ... the answer to your question ... you maybe don't want to *hear* an answer ... you want to *see* an answer ... they need time to think it through ... you want them to reflect ... the pupil will be rushed ... you will be rushed ... and its public and in front of other pupils ... you've got to get stuff set for the next set ... that's what Guidance were set up to deal with ... compartmentalised ... it's to do with the scale of the school.

Mr Pinkman said, it is highly likely that thirty pupils are waiting outside the classroom door for the next class, they may well be noisy and jostling each other. A class teacher cannot take time to talk to a pupil, whilst others are kept waiting. Formal obligations limit his/her time in terms of the next class.

Teachers reported that they are trained to have a greater awareness of the kinds of problems that pupils are faced with, for example a teacher with many years experience of guidance said,

Guidance Teacher: I was totally saturated with kids with problems ... I was no longer meeting normal kids ... kids have exactly the same problems as before ... but we are being taught to recognise them and act on them ... and a *wee* stone can turn into a massive mountain .

Mrs Day reported some teachers 'see' and get 'told' a lot more of about a pupil's personal details than other teachers. In her opinion something about the teacher is conveyed to pupils who feel that he/she were interested in them as people, that over time his/her style of interaction with pupils created feelings of trust and respect which lead to teachers being given confidences. A problem emerges for

teachers who pupils turn to in these situations; to what extent are they prepared to respond, how much time can they offer to pupil, what kinds of resources are available pupil support.

Constrained within conditions, common to state secondary schooling, teachers who wanted to respond to children 'in trouble', typically felt angry.

Mrs Day: I was frequently standing in a corridor as a child was telling me what mum was doing or what dad was doing to mum and I had a class in the classroom ... it is a piece of bloody nonsense ... having to talk to a pupil in a corridor ... teachers with a teaching load and now have to get in Social Workers.

As an example of, '*a wee stone turning into a massive mountain*', Mrs Day's final comment refers to formal responses adults in schools must initiate when a child reports action that might be construed as 'abuse'.

Teachers' accounts correspond with pupils' accounts, as presented in earlier chapters. Teachers frequently suggested pupils negative experience of schooling was significantly shaped by 'outside' influences (Connell 1996: 211).²⁷⁴ In Mrs Day's experience, most teachers did not know the extent of problems that pupils experience outside school, and focused their attention upon getting school work done. A senior guidance teacher commented "... pupils no longer leave their problems outside the classroom door". Class teachers who responded to pupils' social and emotional problems reported their time and emotional energy was drained by paper work and the range of interagency relations created and maintained as a consequence of responding to a child's distress. Teachers were frank, sometimes due to lack of personal energy and/or time he/she chooses not to act.

²⁷⁴ The negative impact of pupils' 'outside' school relations was a common theme among both male and female teachers, in both schools, but, this important point is outwith the focus of this thesis. Some teachers attempted to support individual pupil's with outside school problems by extending their subject base to become a guidance teacher. Other teachers approached pupils outside school problems, for example, by targeting boys from one area and inviting them to join an after school group for football or extra school work.

Teachers knowledge of pupils

Teachers reported a range of ways of forming opinions about pupils. On transition from primary to secondary school, teachers in both schools were **only** informed about pupils who have a record for being troublesome at primary school. Officially this kind of information is passed on with the intention of identifying pupils who may need 'support' during a socially significant transition, but as an unintended outcome of this practice, a pupil's poor reputation with secondary teachers is created.

Mr Pinkman described forming opinions of pupils by observing their 'behaviour', which consists in, the work they produce, the way they speak to each other, and the way they speak to him. Asked with regard to new pupils as they come from Primary School he said,

Mr Pinkman: I only have information about pupils when I go into the classroom if I have already taught them and that won't necessarily be formal information ... unless they've been involved with Guidance for some problem or misdemeanour ... if not the information I have is what I have gleaned from the factors I have already mentioned to you.

He knows about pupils from his past encounters with them, either as their teacher or as a 'yuffty' teacher or in passing around the school.

Formal reports and potential litigation

In City School, a senior teacher reported that written records rarely gave a full account of what teachers actually thought about their pupils, one had to "... read between the lines", because teachers feared the possibility of being accused of libelling their pupils. Almost all teachers' responses to questions were guarded, for example in Town School I recorded, "I am aware members of staff are guarded ... there is an aura of carefulness as they speak".²⁷⁵ Teachers distinguished between informal and formal communication, as "Formal is something official" that generally entailed some kind of documentation, for example filling in forms for parents who want their children referred to guidance. Teachers perceived increasing court

²⁷⁵ Schooling has recently been characterised as a 'parentocracy', which heightens teachers' perceptions of parental power in a 'market' driven education system (Brown 1990).

appearances for teachers called to provide information about specific pupils and a greater likelihood of having to complete inquiry forms from outside agencies such as the Children's Panel as a negative effect of the Children (Scotland) Act (1995). Some teachers acknowledged their non-involvement with pupils beyond formal subject teaching obligations, to argue pupils' social lives were the rightful concern of guidance staff.

Atmospheres in classrooms

Teachers reported, classes are characterised by its social dynamic, which emerged among pupils as they discussed others' actions and social change, which exemplified Durkheim's theoretical legacy of, "... the idea that the force of social influence is experienced by individuals as *exterior and constraining*" (Scheff 1988: 395). Despite, recognition of social dynamics within classes (many teachers referred to 'problem classes') individual 'behaviour' was nevertheless reported as 'causing' negative social atmospheres in classes. Pitkin writes, "Wittgenstein even suggests that we fall back on causal explanations of our actions when we have exhausted explanations in terms of reasons or motives" (Pitkin 1972: 162). In classes where the 'atmosphere' lost its acceptable 'working level of noise', teachers drew upon a combination of personal and professional strengths to restore order in the classroom. Whilst some teachers described making attempts to impose formal order and school work by asserting school rules, other teachers described drawing more on personal negotiation with pupils. Teachers variously expressed criticism of colleagues for failing to take one or other approach.

Teachers reported pupils as routinely talking about non-work or social things as they did their school work, which sometimes created a poor learning and teaching atmosphere in the class. Mr Pinkman, argued a class's commitment to school work, is reflected in its atmosphere. He described classes according to commitment to school work; if high, 'pupil behaviour' was belived to be 'good', if low, 'pupil behaviour' was described as 'tending to be more problematic'. Other teachers made similar comments and suggested pupil 'behaviour' could differ, within a year from one class to another and from one year to the next. Acts of in/discipline often create 'bad' atmospheres in a class.

Most teachers suggested in/discipline arises *partly* because of an inappropriate curriculum, one that cannot meet all pupils' educational needs. In principle, a school's organisation of pupils into academic bandings for Standard Grade, that is,

Foundation/General (F/G) and General/Credit (G/C) classes, provides pupils with access to a flexible curriculum.²⁷⁶ However, teachers expressed doubts that this worked in practice.

Mr. Pinkman: The focus on the work of the General people in the Foundation/General class is not the same as the General people in the General/Credit class ... they tend to be influenced more by the credit people ... it should in fact be an overlap but it is not. It seems to me to be a split ... General in the Foundation/General group gets pulled towards the Foundation end and the General in the General/Credit get pulled towards the credit end and that's why ... even if they were using the same course book, which they aren't, so its difficult anyway ... but that's why there's little ... there's no movement usually from Foundation/General class to a General/Credit even though in theory people who are doing well in Foundation/General who are going to achieve a General could go into a General/Credit class ... There is supposed to be potential to move from one to another.

Teachers generally reported General/Foundation classes as a site of more negative academic practices among pupils. Often the issue of poor or absent pieces of homework took up class time as teachers asked individual pupils for an explanation. Despite having 'academic ability' to attain Standard Grade at a General level, such pupils did not produce well thought out pieces of classwork for examination portfolios.²⁷⁷

Problems related to the curriculum were not necessarily explained by reference to Foundation/General classes. Mr Pinkman also described two S3, G/C classes where pupils were roughly expected to attain similar G/C Standard Grade results. One class was,

²⁷⁶ Sociology of Education has traditionally critiqued the concept of 'academic ability' and Scotland has its own mythic version in the 'lad o' pairs'. See (Pring and Walford 1997) and (Bryce and Humes 1999: 37-48) for recent sociological and educational accounts of debates about state imposed curriculum and teacher professionalism.

²⁷⁷ This practical implication of this point is highly significant in an educational climate where government advocates 'performance related pay' for teachers, and as a measure of that performance, links 'pupil achievement' as reflected in school league tables, to financial resourcing of schools. See Nick Davies, 'The Big Cheat: Fiddling the facts and figures in the struggle for success.' in *The Guardian*, Tuesday, July 11, 2000. These factors impact in negative ways on a school's reputation.

Mr Pinkman: ... talkative, boisterous, not focused upon education or their subject ... whereas a previous S3 was the opposite, quieter, more focused, more attentive on the work that was to be done... .

Mr Coleman gave a similar account of pupils as generally varied in their attention span, as reluctant to become sufficiently absorbed in their school work. More worryingly, teachers considered a poor curriculum contributes towards individual pupils' low 'self' esteem. In this scenario, negative and painful feelings are exacerbated when a pupil's academic inability is evident among more able peers. When pupils, for example are 'setted' for a subject and find they cannot manage an aspect of the work. In City School, pupils frequently present guidance staff with this problem, as a guidance teacher said, " ... they don't want to be shown up by other people".

Mrs McGuin: I have found in my experience with Foundation Courses they are not meeting the needs of most of those pupils ... there's too much demand for reading and writing they are not capable of, even at the level of Foundation ... they need more practical based course ... so if they take Art they can cope with that but if they do that they have to deal with Art critically ... even PE you've got all these work sheets to do ... in other areas it is **too easy** [teacher's emphasis] ... so it is not meeting the needs of every youngster.

Where the curriculum provided is inappropriate for a pupil at the foundation end of provision, or for pupils who are grouped on the basis of having similar learning difficulties, negative feelings are intensified.²⁷⁸ Teachers report pupils as 'acting out' (pupils call 'radging') or 'self' excluding (pupils call 'skiving') (Bourdieu 1990: 141-176).

Pupils 'in trouble' at school may 'act out' or 'be withdrawn'

In both schools, teachers described two forms of pupil action, 'withdrawing' and 'acting out', which illustrated 'communicative action' among pupils and their teachers as having a gendered dimension and negative social and educational outcomes. Teachers reported a common problem in teaching; meeting the

²⁷⁸ Academic, official and professional literature refers to this kind of action among pupils considered to be 'underachievers' as 'disaffected'. See for example, Blyth and Milner (1996: 214-215) *Exclusion from School: Inter-professional issues for policy and practice*.

'educational needs' of 'one' pupil in the context of 'many' pupils. Problems associated with a pupil 'acting out' in a class, for example involved him/her being taken to a more private place, so that he/she could "cool down", which meant interrupting teaching/learning process. Many teachers recognised a pupil's 'withdrawing' or 'acting out', could be variously interpreted by different teachers.²⁷⁹

Senior teachers at Town School described some girls *and* boys as 'quiet' pupils, in the sense of being significantly unhappy. 'Quiet' pupils do not 'act out' their thoughts and feelings about problems, but rather appeared to internalise her/his difficulties. An AHT of many years experience of working with 'troubled' youngsters, described girls as **relatively** less aggressive than boys, and, as **stereotypically** coping with stress in different ways. He illustrated his point with a story. A girl who had difficulty with her size relative to other girls, had for five years anguished about her size. The AHT said, " ... she went through the motions of physically turning up for school, but was torn up inside". She was thought to have built up a defence in primary school by 'withdrawing' socially in attempts to protect herself, was unable to engage in positive informal processes that shaped learning. As a negative outcome of this action, she was considered to have not 'learned' as well as she might have done.²⁸⁰

Teachers in both schools described having to send a pupil out of the classroom, so that he/she "don't blow it in the classroom". As I was shown around the learning support room, I witnessed what 'blowing' involved. Two or three pupils were working quietly in the large sunny room. Suddenly, the door flew open and in an instance the atmosphere in the room completely changed; it became electric. A Principle Teacher of Guidance, 'brought' in an S1 or S2 pupil, whose face was as red as a tomato. The boy's body emanated tension; its heat could be felt as he passed by me. His palpable distress was clearly at a level that would be unwise to ignore. As we left the room, to give the boy a measure of privacy, the 'learning support' teacher

²⁷⁹ The problems outlines in Chapter One were referred to by an AHT, responsible for Pastoral and Educational Welfare, cautioned me on the use of any label on the grounds of its questionable adequacy to define the range of difficulties pupils experience during their school life, for example, 'sebd' implied children could be troubled by, physical ill health, poverty, and cognitive problems in learning.

²⁸⁰ There is a vast educational psychology literature, which addresses links between affective states and cognitive ability and 'learning outcomes'.

told me I had witnessed an outcome, fairly typical of 'acting out behaviour', for this particular boy, and, among boys generally.²⁸¹

Teachers' views on 'discipline'

Among teachers, I found differences of opinion about how to deal with serious acts of pupil in/discipline. Teachers generally argued pragmatic action is required to solve problems in meeting 'educational needs' of 'one' among 'many' pupils. Whilst teaching was described as involving 'disciplining pupils', guidance teachers were largely expected to handle 'discipline problems' of 'troublesome' pupils. An AHT posed the question, "Does the public expect us to cure or contain ... what is our function"?²⁸²

Pupils 'deserving' and 'non-deserving' of support?

Teachers' accounts of their school's guidance provision revealed pupil action was judged in three main ways: a school's ethos as constituted by its normative expectation of pupils by st/age, a teacher's normative views on punishment vis-a-vis support, and a teacher's assessment of a pupil's 'fit with' academic and social standards (Ghail 1988: 37-83).²⁸³ A senior teacher at Town School, for example asked me to interview pupils who did *not* get into trouble at school. He implicitly suggested that 'good' pupils were more deserving of being heard, as he offered to **choose** pupils "... who are fed up of behaviour". Teachers differentiated among pupils 'in trouble', as 'good' (deserving) and 'bad' (non-deserving) of support. Pupil in/discipline was distinguished either as **wilful in/discipline** (bad) or, in/discipline that was an outcome of action legitimated, to an extent, by official labels, for example 'behavioural difficulties'. Whether a teacher interpreted pupil action as

²⁸¹ This incident took place during my first visit to Town School. At this early point I began to think about the role and importance of the casual or informal comment as it contributed a) to knowledge of how things worked and b) the shaping of knowledge about individuals within that practice (See Chapter Four and its arguments about reputations at school).

²⁸² See Carl Parsons (1999: 1-21) for an educational account that adopts a functionalist perspective on schools and schooling.

²⁸³ See Munn, Lloyd and Cullen (2000: 49-69) for a discussion that links 'school ethos' and 'exclusion'; authors draw upon data to conceptualise a school's ethos in two ways, as 'encouraged or discouraged exclusion'.

wilful or not, action was referred to as 'bad' behaviour, which adumbrated the specific normative character of teachers interpretative work.

In practice, teachers' responses to 'bad' behaviour were described in two ways: pupils either *should be* punished, or *should be* supported.²⁸⁴ In both schools, teachers justified 'sending out' pupils from classrooms; either because the pupil 'ought to be' in different kind of provision, or because he/she was seen as 'less deserving' than other pupils. Teachers beliefs about how best to 'treat' pupils, particularly in times of stress among pupils or if pupils failed to co-operate by doing their school work, were reflected in the kind of 'learning support' they would endorse. Teachers' descriptions of debates in the recent past related to the type and cost of provision for pupils classified, variously as having 'behavioural' problems or as needing 'learning support'. At Town School, two teachers, who strongly advocated support for pupils 'in trouble', both told me of colleagues' disapproving comments about it's 'behavioural unit'. On seeing the provision and hearing about its methods, a teacher said, "... this isn't punishment". A lack of teacher support for the provision had lead to its closure, officially justified as due to lack of resources.

Teachers at Town School discussed 'bad' behaviour more frequently in terms of **punishment** than **support**; those who took the first view conflated 'discipline' with 'punishment' to argue their own and the school's response should be organised around setting clear rules and regulations, in association with sanctions. Town School's past focus on 'behaviour' reflected essentialist perceptions of certain boys as 'bad'. A class described as, "... for 'bad' boys", for example organised in attempts to address 'behavioural difficulties' of selected boys, had been abandoned because boys tried to be the best at being 'bad'! Teachers who took the second view did not reject the importance of establishing clear boundaries about what was acceptable 'behaviour', but the idea that pupils might need support as a necessary feature of teacher response. The latter view was evident in a teacher's expressed concern to ask deeper questions about the context of the 'incident', and were prepared to 'talk through' with a pupil ways to remedy a current situation, and to offer supportive strategies to help avoid future 'incidents'.

²⁸⁴ See, Munn, Lloyd and Cullen (2000: 54-55) where authors discuss teachers' views of pupils as 'worthy or unworthy of help'.

Town School's intention to make appropriate educational provision had unintended outcomes for pupils allocated to alternative resources; pupils are labelled as 'problem pupils'. Town School teachers described such resources as organised under two headings 'learning' support and 'behavioural' support. At school level, 50% pupils were roughly allocated to each category, thus revealing decisions that labelled a pupil's 'main difficulty in learning' in terms of 'cognitive' or 'behavioural' reasons.

City School teachers' accounts focused less upon punishment, but the idea of 'deserving' or 'non-deserving' pupils was evident in comment on kinds of support available and who should receive it. A guidance focus upon 'emotional' difficulties *rather* than 'behavioural' difficulties created a different climate of debate from Town School. Girls, for example were offered access to special classes organised and facilitated by professionals from 'outside' the school, and counselling services were on offer, and to a limited degree pupils were able to access these for themselves. City School's provision included a 'learning base' as distinct from 'learning support'. The former provision could be accessed by pupils and/or parents, and teachers could refer pupils for some lessons, to do timetabled work. Rhona was offered the use of the learning base as an alternative to truanting from a particular class teacher, whom she found too emotionally difficult to handle. Rhona's teacher exemplified teachers antagonistic towards the 'learning base', describing it as offering choice to pupils, which effectively challenged class teachers necessary exercise of legitimate authority, thus their capacity to keep order and control in the classroom. In times of stress, teachers aware of their obligation to 'teach the curriculum' tended to categorise pupils according to 'bad' behaviour, as 'deserving' of punishment, rather 'deserving' of 'learning support'.

Whose job is it to 'discipline' 'problem pupils'?

Interpretations of pupil action, categorised as non-serious or serious 'bad' behaviour, constituted on-going debate among teachers, variously characterised from co-operative to antagonistic. Among guidance teachers, a clear distinction is drawn between tasks assigned to guidance and discipline teachers, for example

Mrs McGuin: ... a guidance teacher isn't a disciplinarian. Although the guidance teacher may know what is going on in such and such a class, but the question is they want to know why? It is not a question of discipline but more a question of why people behave in that way? ... but I am not responsible for the discipline. I am responsible for trying to help them (pupils) get on the right track, but many members of staff think that guidance is the disciplinarian .

At Town School a senior guidance teacher, critical of some colleagues, argued if teachers knew about guidance they didn't fully understand its rationales and/or the range of support available at the SLG level, "If you asked some teachers about the School Liaison Group²⁸⁵, they would be 'stymied' ". Data show many teachers knew about Youth Strategy, a collaborative approach to helping pupils in difficulties, but many class teachers and one 'learning support' teacher **did not to know** about SLG resources.

Normative labelling at school

The negative effects of labelling children, according to a category, are well rehearsed (Warnock Report 1978; HM Inspectors Report, 1978). Despite an awareness of the negative effects of labelling, teachers' gossip among themselves, intended to let off steam after a hard morning, often had unintended negative outcomes for a pupil or a class; the application of a stigmatised reputation, for example as a 'type' of pupil and/or 'kinds' of class.

In some cases, a pupil's exclusion is socially effected through a teacher's attempt to restore formal order, either through public shaming or inducing guilt in a pupil. Robin's and Rhona's descriptions of one teacher's actions reflect their contradictory responses to his treatment of pupils. Robin felt comforted by his perception that the teacher's shaming and ridicule of certain boys kept male aggression in class under control. Rhona felt personally threatened by the teacher's way of speaking to pupils, and took every opportunity to exclude herself from his classes. Garfinkel identifies 'shame', 'guilt' and 'boredom' as denoted in the "... removal of self from public view"; as a way of affecting a withdrawal from group solidarity, in this case, a class

²⁸⁵ The concept of School Liaison Groups and Youth Strategy are briefly discussed in earlier chapters.

engaged in its educational task (1956: 421). Two social effects are experienced by a pupil who 'looses face'; a loss of 'self' esteem and a loss of 'social' esteem. Witnesses to these kinds of encounters almost certainly describe them to others, thus contributing to some kind of reputation.

Ross's story illustrates the social construction of a person in terms of a reputation, which is gained partly by an actor's persistent repetition of actions to which the reputation refers; a reputation for 'doing' becomes a person's 'identity'; a person known as having established a pattern of action, is socially defined as 'being'. Ross was frequently identified by pupils and teachers as a 'skiver'. Ross's consent to participate in classroom observations was formally asked for and given. But, on the day agreed for the observations he decided not to attend school. Ross did not warn me of his decision and as the day progressed, I realised that in turning up for the classes as arranged, I was drawing teachers and pupils attention to his absence, thus reinforcing his reputation for 'skiving' (doing) and as a 'skive' (being). In time, Ross's repeated absence from school, (not a direct consequence of the above) triggered a series of mechanisms in the school's guidance support system, which ensured a pupil did not fall through the 'net and get lost' in the busy day-to-day demands upon guidance teachers. In this case, Ross's persistent absence led to his case appearing on the SLG agenda, which I observed. In this forum, Ross was no longer referred to as a 'skiver' as teachers referred to him officially as a 'truant'. Ross's case contradicts teacher stereotypes as he did not act in an aggressive way, (so was not Excluded) he acted in a stereotypically female way by 'skiving' from school. The SLG considered other possible supportive measures, but the sanction of Exclusion *was not* discussed. Despite Ross's consistent 'self' exclusion from much of his schooling, guidance teachers were still able to rely upon the active support of sufficient class teachers to continue to encourage him to 'attend' school.²⁸⁶

Stereotypical views of gender: alive and well

Although all teachers associated boys with 'acting out' and girls with 'withdrawal', a **majority of teachers** interviewed found it difficult to talk about gender as constitutive of formal practice. Teachers' accounts show they drew upon social

²⁸⁶ I inadvertently overheard a conversation between two teachers, which allows me to make this statement, however, further details would most certainly compromise any claims to secure participants anonymity.

stereotypes of boys and girls to achieve order in classrooms. Male teachers described treating boys differently to girls and female teachers described treating boys differently to girls. Nevertheless, differential treatment was not seen as discriminatory as all teachers in both schools described girls and boys as naturally differentiated in stereotypical terms that drew upon biological categories of male and female. Teachers unproblematically explained social behaviour in terms of 'masculinity' and 'femininity'. Teachers perceived gender differences as 'natural differences' that were 'worked with' in the business of getting 'school work' done. Teachers' encounters with pupils emerged as normatively gendered; teachers' gendered ideas shaped how boys and girls were expected to behave in class or in interactions with teachers.

Teachers differential treatment of boys and girls

All teachers differentiate between boys and girls 'talking in class' in stereotypical ways. Mr Pinkman's descriptions of what he thought boys and girls talked about in class, indicated that boys interacted more noisily in comparison to girls (Howe 1996).

Mr Pinkman: Boys are shouting at each other. They want to be friends but are not comfortable with intimacies. That's why they have to start hitting each other and shouting at each to keep the distance.

Girls interactions were characterised as more intimate, for example girls most frequently formed a pair or small grouping, which generally were not perceived as potentially aggressive in a physical way. Teachers generally perceived girls 'talking in class' in the following way.

Mr Pinkman: Chatting with friends, boys, make up, groups they fancy that's the usual ... boys maybe don't get on with their work either but its just, yeah well there's a lot of talking goes on as well. But the thing with the more boisterous behaviour rarely involves girls, so there's that addition for the boys.

Teachers gave girls a row for talking about social concerns when they were expected to get on with their school work.

Teachers described girls as generally more articulate than boys. Girls were perceived as able to speak confidently in class, for example whereas even in social circumstances of a football class boys were not confident speakers. One teacher reported,

Mr Fineman: More often lads couldn't do that ... you ...
I would be doing all the work in the conversation.

Gender stereotypes were mapped onto teachers definitions of the 'mature' pupil. Mr Kyte reported, for example that pupils who do not keep up with teachers definition of 'maturity' are "... accused of being immature and these tend to be proportionately boys rather than girls". Mr Kyte referred to Norwegian research findings about the relative 'maturity' of boys to girls; boys cluster at one end and girls at the other, findings that 'fitted with' his experience of teaching boys and girls. Mr Pinkman also referred to research as having well documented boys as less mature than girls of the same age and reported general expectations among teachers that boys will act differently relative to girls of the same age.

Women teachers generally described a preference for teaching boys. Women teachers state specifically that they would rather teach boys than girls. No women teachers expressed a preference for teaching girls. As Mrs Gatherer said "I like 'bad' boys". Mrs Marsh's response to my direct question "do you think teachers treat boys and girls differently?" was to describe how she preferred to teach boys.

Mrs Marsh: I am more tolerant of the 'witty remark' of
a boy than a female ... I admire that side of boy's
natures. I find boys easier to get on with ... girls are
more prone to mood swings .

Mrs Marsh especially liked the "cheeky sparky boys" because they were beneficial for her subject. Mrs Marsh talked comfortably about gender in terms of gender 'roles', which was an integral part of the subject she taught.²⁸⁷ Mrs Marsh quickly categorised boys in terms of types as the intelligent type, the bullied, the bully, not very bright boy, the 'sparky cheeky' boy. Mrs Marsh categorised girls in relatively negative terms as 'mouthy', bitchiness, sullen and tending to give her the 'look' and/or the 'tut' as expressions of displeasure and not wanting to co-operate with her requests. Mrs Marsh offered a normative distinction between *how* girls and boys failed to co-operate; in her opinion girls were devious whilst she described boys as basically more honest.

²⁸⁷ Identification of the subject might lead to the identification of the teacher.

Women teachers particularly described feeling that they have to keep boys under control more so than girls. Mrs Marsh consciously differentiated very sharply between boys and girls in terms of traditional gender stereotypes; she described boys as more likely to engage in physical horse play, kick for fun, puppy play and just general 'immaturity'. Mrs Marsh argued that fear of boys interactions escalating into violence, presented teachers with a continuous task of keeping them under control.

Norms of gender: 'hegemonic' masculinity and 'mature' girls

Among male and female teachers boys are defined in terms of 'natural' stereotypes. Fine grained data analysis presented below illustrates *how* boys interact with each other and male teachers, which effectively challenges a teacher's authority at a personal and professional level (Ghaill 1994: 36-40).²⁸⁸ Mr Pinkman illustrated this point in his description of the difference between boys, whom he considers, 'cause' problems and boys who don't 'cause' problems. A difference between boys is described in terms of the degree of aggressive physicality evident in encounters between boys.

Mr Pinkman: ... its to do with being a boy ... to do with being aggressive being combative, competitive with each other simply in terms of the way they speak to each other or the way they relate to each other physically ... they start to hit each other ... of course you can put other interpretations on that but and that is where there is a problem

Mr Pinkman thought any 'interpretation' put upon interactions between boys, which includes physical contact, is precisely the point debated among boys and between boys and their teachers. The issue is to establish a pecking order between males; who the 'authority' is among males present in an encounter, and beyond! Teachers' accounts show that some intend to effect social control of a situation by publicly embarrassing a boy. In being **seen** by a class, for example as able to control

²⁸⁸ Mac an Ghaill (1994) draws upon Connell (1985: 153) to argue discipline is treated as an aspect of a formal relation considered the appropriate domain of "... real men", whilst 'caring' is associated with informality and women teachers. At both schools in this research staff responsible for discipline were men, nevertheless, men and women were equally represented among the guidance staff.

a boy who threatens to disrupt teaching/learning or someone's personal safety, is expected to preserve his rightful authority as a teacher and a male person.

Some male teachers' descriptions of 'facing up' to boys over non-serious non-cooperation, suggested interactions among males were normatively coercive and threatening. Mr Pinkman when asked if he ever felt threatened by boys answered " ... no I go and lift weights". His own way of presenting himself as a man to boys reflected his view that " ... male's will respond to a sense of physical threat ... because that is what life is like for them outside". He later clarified his point saying " ... I don't want you to get the impression I use any sort of physical threat towards boys. We are talking about a perception ... an intuition that boys will respond to that and girls do not". He went on to suggest an impression of 'hardness' among males is subtly created through bodily posture and attitude rather than actual bodily contact.

Mr Pinkman: You can also ... not so much in the classroom but this is what they respond to ... posture ... there's a lot of implied threat, a potential violence there which will cause someone to back down or not to get involved and it is that perception that posturing that boys will respond to even though it is not a real one in any way whatsoever ... You would be sacked if it became real.

Mr Pinkman thought that girls did not respond well to the 'implied threat' approach, which he feels enables him to keep boys under his control.

Mr Pinkman: You can't do that with girls (as a man) they'll brush off my looking annoyed or lowering my voice to express anger or even a movement forward to show I'm annoyed. They can stand up to that. They don't feel an intuitive sense of threat so it doesn't ... discipline with girls can be a wee bit more tricky.

Mr Pinkman liked to teach girls because they were generally more responsible than boys, and were able to get on with their school work in a way that required less intervention and direction on the part of the teacher, which was a commonly articulated view among male teachers.

Mr Coleman was typical of many teachers who, when directly asked to describe pupils in terms of gender, denied that gender was a significant issue. Teachers were more comfortable indisscussing problems in teaching as problems of learning as distinct from problems of 'behaviour'. Mr Coleman, for example argued that a pupil, boy or girl, must 'fit with' *his* idea of how a pupil ought to approach their school

work. He expressed his preference for teaching 'good' pupils who were interested and able to achieve in his topic and argued that pupils' problems at school lay in their failure to accept academic rules. His idea of a 'good' pupil 'fitted with' his description of the ways in which most girls, in his experience, applied themselves to their school work. This kind of pupil was a 'deserving pupil', whom he contrasted with two S3 boys he described himself as "tolerating" because he knows they will not go on to take his topic in S4,

Mr Coleman: A lot of the troublesome kids don't choose to do [my topic] maybe it isn't tough enough for them.

Ironically, I observed one of Mr Coleman's classes, which contained four girls, whose official status at school contradicted his statements on 'gender' and 'troublesome kids'. All four were participants in my research, girls whom he would describe as troublesome, as they all were on 'sheets'. Two were 'in serious trouble' and two were in 'not so serious trouble'. Later in his discussion, Mr Coleman described his subject as attracting more and more girls every year as pupils viewed his topic in the way Home Economics was viewed; as a 'girls' topic.

Gender: in/discipline or relational difficulties?

Among boys, relational difficulties were described as expressed in 'fighting' as physical hurting. Among girls, relational difficulties were described as 'falling out', which implied 'difficulties' were expressed in terms of a silence between two or three girls. Although potentially threatening and highly disruptive of a classroom situation, a 'fight' between boys carried a kind of honour and status that certainly gave rise to excitement and gossip. Whereas, 'falling out' between girls did not create disruption and disturbance to a class, but was referred to in denigrated terms, for example girls involved were "silly wee lassies". Mr Coleman, for example when asked if he ever felt threatened by girls laughed, which implied the question was ridiculous. Mr Kyte drew attention to 'problem girls' as not 'fitting' gender stereotyping.

Mr Kyte: On the other hand when ... problem girls in opposition to what is going on in the classroom they can be more fearless, more resolute, more damaging and more dangerous than boys. I mean dangerous and damaging to themselves and the balance of the climate and environment in the classroom. They can have a greater effect and seem to do so more often.²⁸⁹

Teachers generally thought girls 'in serious trouble' relative to similarly defined boys were more problematic.

Women teachers generally described girls as involved in acts of relatively non-serious non-co-operation. A 'learning support' teacher suggested problems of 'self esteem among girls created greater difficulties for teachers who wished to support such a girl.

Mrs Gatherer: Girls at this school who are not successful tend to be defeated ... work with boys who will challenge means you have got something coming at you ... you can jolly them along whereas girls don't want to be jollied or find the fun. The girls I know are lost causes ... boys are more able to get going.

In these situations teachers generally described girls as 'behaving' in a sullen and withdrawn way, a view that contrasts with Mr Kyte's view of the social effects of girls acts of in/discipline (Woods .

Contradictions :gender and schooling

Teachers denial of gender as constitutive of learning was contradicted by evidence of their support and participation in measures targeted either at boys or girls. A male teacher,²⁹⁰ for example began research into 'under-achieving boys' to explore and understand why 'under-achieving boys' in his classes were poor at and/or not interested in school work; he was concerned to understand meanings and intentions of boys who were upsetting and disturbing other pupils around them. The teacher's

²⁸⁹ His tone and look were terrifying to me then and in writing his words I can still feel the negative effects of the passion with which he made his statement. I didn't ever understand the source of this passion.

²⁹⁰ The teacher is not named. Due to the small number of teachers included in this research the teacher could be identified, but, the substantive significance of his research is important to note, whilst I consider it not right to even give him a pseudonym.

rejection of talking about pupils in terms of gender corresponded with other male teachers, whilst his approach to a problem currently defined as 'underachieving boys' contrasted with other male teachers in that his normative view was that 'all pupils were entitled to education'. Most teachers discussed 'behavioural difficulties' not in terms of a pupil's entitlement to education, but pragmatically²⁹¹ in terms of individuals as 'lacking academic ability' or as 'bad' and/or 'undeserving'. His focus of attention was not upon their actions in class, although his views about the effect of their actions was unequivocal. All pupils he said "Have a right to learn without disruption" (Askew & Ross 1988: 17).²⁹² His personal expectation of the research was that it would help him be a better teacher. Normative principles of state education, 'equality of opportunity' and 'achievement for all', are variously contradicted by teachers' differential treatment of girls and boys. Their differentially treatment of girls and boys was largely justified in reference to 'naturalist' stereotypes and a sense of a pupil as 'good' or 'bad'.

It is salutary to remember that pupils say teachers are reluctant to recognise personal change. The problem of changing one reputation for another, at least from having a 'bad' reputation to gaining a 'good' reputation is a consistent theme throughout pupils discussions is about being 'in trouble' at school. Illustrating a view held by pupils in both schools, Gary said "If you've got a reputation ... you canna ...the teachers won't let it lie. They always think your gonna be really bad all the time." Across both schools pupils reiterated their belief that once a reputation for 'bad' behaviour is assigned, as Gary said "... it follows you round the school..." and Phillip said, "Aye. Ye cannae really shake it off really." Phillip expressed a view held by boys and girls across both schools that the main problem associated with

²⁹¹ See M. Hammersley (1977) 'Teacher Perspectives' Units 9 -10 of Course E202, *Schooling and Society*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press for his discussion of 'teaching styles'. Wood's draws attention to Hammersley's categorisation of teachers' approaches to problems encountered in teaching, for example, acting pragmatically within whatever conditions they find themselves to be teaching, to argue, placing teachers in categories is a useful sorting device. But, a device that is counterproductive in terms of professional development as such categorisation or 'labelling' of teachers, "shape [teachers'] behaviour towards [pupils] in accordance with the label and they may come to respond in line with that: that is [teachers] come to act out, and hence confirm, the behaviour expected of them"(1990: 5).

²⁹² Askew and Ross (1988: 17) were contacted by teachers who wanted to resolve similar problems with boys, to find that teachers expected boys, categorised as working-class and/or 'black', to present them with problems at school.

attempting to change a reputation lay with teachers who were reluctant to accept the 'new' reformed self.

Loss of face: illustrations of gender in action

Teachers' normative understandings of pupils and classes, for example as a 'troublemaker' or 'problem classes', evidently leads to social and/or educational exclusion. Gender stereotypes act as normative references in teachers' interpretations of pupil interactions.

- 'troublemaker' as total identity

Pupils gave many examples of peers as being known as 'troublemakers', a 'bad' reputation that conveys the notion of being " ... 'totally' identified" in Garfinkel's sense, "That is, these identities ... refer to persons as "motivational" types rather than as "behavioural" types not to what a person may be expected to have done or to do (in Parsons' term, to his "performances") but to what the group holds to be the ultimate "grounds" or "reasons" for his performance" (Garfinkel 1956: 420). Across both schools, pupils with a 'troublemaker' reputation are referred to by teachers and pupils, for example Rory described a girl Excluded from school as "She's just a troublemaker" in a tone of voice that indicates such a person is perceived to have created a general social affect that Garfinkel describes as "moral indignation". As a social response to a 'total identity', "Moral indignation is public denunciation", which Garfinkel argues has an affect of reinforcing " ... group solidarity" (Garfinkel 1956: 420 - 421). Group solidarity is socially achieved in what Garfinkel called a "status degradation ceremony", which involves,

Any communicative work between person, whereby the public identity of an actor is transformed into something looked on as lower in the local scheme of social types, will be called a "status degradation ceremony" ... (Garfinkel 1956: 420).

The following description illustrates how public use of 'threat' towards a pupil 'total identified' as Excluded is achieved through a process of 'loss of face'.

Mr Pinkman's declared commitment as a teacher was to those that were 'able' and wanted to learn and in so doing belonged on that basis either to his class and/or the school. Mr Pinkman described such an encounter between him and a boy who had been Excluded from school. The boy was heard threatening pupils in the playground and was considered as potentially able and willing to use violence

against other pupils. Mr Pinkman's argument was that in this kind of situation it was important for a teacher to preserve personal dignity and professional authority in front of pupils so that pupils would feel they could go to a teacher when bullied by other pupils. The way to do that in his view was to seize the initiative in the encounter and in so doing establish the Excluded boy as " ... in essence of a lower species" (Garfinkel 1956: 421).

Mr Pinkman: With him I just faced up to him completely and put him down in front of the pupils because I wasn't threatened at all ... if I had not been seen to be able to face up to somebody like that, that wouldn't have been a good message for pupils who might be bullied in the future.

Public interaction between a teacher and pupil in this way illustrates a teacher's control as achieved through shaming or invoking guilt in the pupil, which had a social affect of him withdrawing from the interaction. Mr Pinkman intended that pupils see him win the day by asserting and thus confirming his authority over pupils through his public humiliation of the boy. As a 'troublemaker', such a person is 'bad' and therefore not entitled to judgement according to the same rules as 'good' pupils.

The next account illustrates a pupil's exclusion from class as shaped by a teacher's normative views of where a pupil should be taught when he/she requires 'learning support' and/or does not conform to the ideal of a 'mature pupil'. These problems are shown to be amplified by normative expectations of girls. Mr Pinkman's above account reminded me of a similar classroom confrontation I had observed between him a female pupil. I recalled that he had said to Jo "You will play by my rules", in a tone of voice that conveyed serious intent to control her. Jo's refusal to co-operate with Mr Pinkman's request to 'turn around in her seat' pushed him to the point where, as part of the current strategy regarding rules and sanctions, he had had to call in an Assistant Head. He recalled,

Mr Pinkman: It became a confrontation that I knew I had to win which I knew I would because I would just take it as far as it had to go and which is what happened... she had to be removed... she had moved to another seat (when Mr Pinkman left the room to call the Assistant Head) I wasn't accepting that because that was her deciding how the discipline was going to work and when it was going to work and I wasn't having that ... that was why I kicked her right out and she did come back and promise to behave .

Mr Pinkman's recollection of that encounter during his interview was summed in terms of 'not loosing face', professionally in the first instance, but also in personal terms. Jo is an example of a teacher's belief about in/discipline as linked to ability.

Mr Pinkman: She's 'learning support' so if you can get her to jolly along you are doing reasonably well.

In 'yuffty' class conditions, Jo was expected to study a subject the teacher considered was more complicated than she was capable of achieving. Witness to the above encounter, Matthew commented that when the 'real' teacher was absent it was less boring to watch a pupil and teacher test each other to the limit than to get on with school work!

Mr Fineman described a similar incident in that it emerged from an interaction between a male teacher and a girl, but dissimilar in that his formal interactions were normatively constituted by his belief that pupils 'have an entitlement to education' and that 'good teachers' try to understand a pupil's negativity towards schooling. In reference to a flyer for a night-club that she was waving about in the classroom Mr Fineman asked her to "Please put it away". She said "No" and continued to wave it about. He described how he had calmly asked her three times explaining "I wasn't going to back down I was going to see it through and work with it." He elaborated,

Mr Fineman: She was obviously testing me and I knew that was what was going on so we had to have a word outside. Then from speaking to other folk she has apparently done this many times before to people that she likes or people that she is testing out. I never thought it was anything to do with gender and I never felt threatened by her ...

Outside the classroom the pupil handed over the flyer and both returned to the classroom. Mr Fineman did not push the dis/agreement to the same extreme as Mr Pinkman. The contrasting use of language of the two teachers, "kicked her out" and "work with it" reflects on the one hand, a more coercive assertion of formal rules and on the other, a more negotiated approach to pupils, which arguably reflects the normative views a teacher brings to interaction.

Justification for Mr Pinkman's treatment of pupils rested upon his view that due to personal limitations, the boy and girl concerned were educationally *out of place*. According to her teacher's view, Jo ought to have been educated in a different class and provided with a different curriculum, whilst the boy's denigrated status as

Excluded, identified him as 'non-deserving' and as not 'belonging' to that school. Mr Pinkman's public humiliation of the boy relied upon other pupils witness of Mr Pinkman's acts of shaming to achieve an outcome of reinforcing the boy's social and educational exclusion as dialectically linked. Pupils described feeling pretty uncomfortable in such situations as they did not necessarily see the teacher's side of the story and expressed empathy with excluded pupils. The teacher justified his interactions with both pupils in reference to normative personal views, whilst he used school rules to legitimate his treatment of the pupils as a way of restoring 'formal order'. In similar situations with girls in class, Mr Fineman's contrasting treatment effectively retained his and her personal dignity and by extension the dignity and respect of the pupil audience, who were not forced to witness 'one of their own' being humiliated. In so doing, these pupils knew they would be treated with similar respect should he/she transgress formal expectations; teacher action that effectively created a sense of personal safety within a group.

Summary of gender findings

In the light of teachers' accounts of teaching boys and girls, the disproportionate rate of Exclusion of boys relative to girls emerges as contradiction. Some male teachers were *unaware* of a gendered differential rate of Exclusion. Some teachers are critical of the appropriateness of the curriculum and acknowledge that some colleagues are 'enough to try the patience of a saint'. Nevertheless, teachers' explanations of Exclusion point towards an individual pupil. Teachers argue that it is the character of a pupil and/or his/her 'behaviour' in class that leads to Exclusion. Teachers' references to social aspects of Exclusion, focused on the social effects of problems 'caused' by a pupil, for example in 'acting out' in class.

In practice, boys and girls are categorised according to a 'teacher norm' of a 'mature' pupil. All teachers largely **expect** girls to 'naturally' get on with their school work and to act responsibly, whilst boys are 'naturally' expected to act more aggressively than girls. Boys actions are afforded a greater degree of licence relative to girls on the normative grounds that boys are less mature than girls of the same st/age. Teachers acknowledged that not all boys and girls 'fitted with' gender stereotypes. Consistent with these views, boys were more closely associated with 'acting out', whilst girls were more closely associate with 'withdrawing', for example girls were reported as more likely to 'truant' than to create serious problems within the classroom. Male teachers stated a preference for teaching girls. Some male teachers

reported treating boys in socially threatening ways that were legitimated by ideas of machismo among men. Some male teachers actively sought to help boys whom they perceive as 'naturally' socially incompetent relative to girls of the same age.

Mrs Gatherer and Mrs Marsh's preference for 'teaching boys', especially 'bad' boys, is contrasted with the fact that no female teacher stated a preference for teaching girls. Many female teachers describe teaching girls as "tedious" and some described girls as less honest than boys. One female 'learning support' teacher described boys' stereotypical 'acting out' as something 'to work with'. In contrast, girls tendency to 'withdrawal' required more teacher time and patience to gain their co-operation.

Male pupils 'in trouble', as long as their actions are not aggressive/violent are more likely than female pupils to receive on-going support from female teachers, which suggests negotiation of interactions (Askew & Ross 1988:13), particularly among male teachers and boys as a fruitful source of future research. Teachers' normative expectations that boys and girls speak and act in relation to each other according to gender stereotypes, shaped teachers interpretation of pupils' actions among pupils and their own interactions with pupils as gendered social actors.

Summary

This chapter presented a reflexive account of teachers' everyday professional lives to include actors' meanings and intentions at school in its attempt to show the negative effects of normative labelling of pupils. Teachers' accounts emphasise teachers and teaching as a professional obligation to teach pupils. Whilst critical of current curriculum as inflexible or appropriate to some pupils learning needs, teachers' expect pupils to school on time, prepared to be taught and do their school work. Teachers normative understandings of their professional obligation gave rise to a concept of the 'mature' pupil as one who wants and accepts learning. Teachers views of boys as 'less mature' than girls at the same st/age, reveals the norms of a school's social order and as such its moral order (Crossley 1998).²⁹³ Teachers nevertheless do not recognise gender as constitutive of Exclusion.

²⁹³See Crossley, N. (1998) *Emotions in Social Life*. London, New York: Routledge: 20, who cites Goffman's (1972) *Relations in Public*. Harmondsworth, Mx: Penguin.

Social interactions between teacher and pupils were largely defined by the demands of the curriculum. Teachers categorise pupils firstly in terms of 'academic ability', by reference to a class level of expected attainment, for example G/C or a F/G and partly by academic attainment/achievement within the class and according to gender. Teachers argue a positive experience of schooling emerges as largely dependent upon teacher/pupil reaching agreement over the formal task in hand, a finding that reflects pupils' normative expectations of teachers. Teachers descriptions of teaching/learning show problems of meaning and intention are infinitely variable and constrained by gendered social norms. An ability to act co-operatively turns to some extent upon actors mutual negotiation of the demands of a teacher/pupil relation (Habermas 1987).

Teachers described 'respect' of pupils and their interest in learning as created during teaching and learning. Teachers expect to interact with pupils in a familiar/informal manner and visa versa, but this 'knowing' was described as an 'at arms length' kind of knowing. Teachers remarked that when able to talk to a pupil with some degree of *privacy* they were often able to relate on a more personal and informal level which facilitated more positive discussion between them. Once a pupil returned to his/her peer group that kind of connection could not be drawn upon. Should a pupil encounter a problem in public view of a class a teacher was forced to talk to the pupil more formally, which involved reference to formal rules and regulations. The interplay between calling upon personal 'knowing' and reference to codified rules to solve problems of order in classrooms emerged as a constant feature of teacher/pupil relations should they engage in debate about how action was interpreted. Teachers claimed to interpret pupil action in reference to codes of conduct, but data show differential treatment of pupils by gender.

Pupils are Excluded from school in two main ways: as a dramatic event or as a process which reflected a pupil's inclusion in a range of supportive strategies. Teachers describe relational difficulties among pupils and with teachers as acted out in gendered ways; boys are more likely to 'act out' and girls are more likely to 'withdraw' from interaction. Female teachers evidently accorded greater licence to boys interactions characterised as naturally 'macho' relative to girls. On the other hand, girls 'bad behaviour' has less likelihood of directly challenging professional expectations of girls as stereotypically girls interactions 'fit with' the interactions expected of a 'mature' pupil. An outcome of teachers' differential expectations of girls compared with boys, is that girls 'bad' behaviour offends against educational

norms, of the 'mature pupil' and gender norms as 'naturally' more co-operative evidenced by teachers views that girls serious in/discipline is "as worse than boys".

Teachers' normative views are evident as their accounts show that pupils are variously perceived as 'deserving' or 'non-deserving' of different kinds of costs entailed in supporting him/her in mainstream school. Teaching is reported as increasingly stressful and time consuming, for example teaching and preparing children for public examinations and accounting for that process to parents (Lawn & Ozga 1988). Pupils who are unable or do not want to learn and produce school work to standards expected of them according to st/age create extra demands on a class teacher's time and energy. Ross's case, typical of many examples, showed the centrality of a guidance teacher's capacity and willingness to devote time and energy to preserve communications between a pupil and his/her class teachers. In helping pupil/teacher to come to mutual agreement about how to achieve an acceptable level of school work, positive negotiation among teachers is highly significant in preventing Exclusion.

As long as a boy is not violent and openly defiant of teachers formal expectations, he more likely than a girl to gain necessary mix of personal interest and professional support , nevertheless, boys are more frequently Excluded from school.

Epilogue

In this thesis I explain the disproportionate numbers of boys relative to girls who experience either *temporary* or *permanent* Exclusion from school. Through its distinctive focus on 'negotiated orders' at school, which demonstrated a continuing significance of gender in everyday interaction, the thesis challenges behaviourist accounts of problems in/discipline and Exclusion. The thesis presents a social constructionist explanation of in/discipline and Exclusion to argue that pupils necessarily negotiate a dialectical relation within processes of informal inclusion/exclusion and academic inclusion/exclusion at school by reference to formal and/or informal social norms. The thesis argue strongly that the problem of Exclusion impacts negatively upon the 'self', the social and ultimately wider society.

Exclusion, 'in trouble' and gender

Exclusion is defined as an outcome of a pupil's inability or lack of desire to negotiate the demands of compulsory 'school relations' and the curriculum, which comes to a head when a pupil expresses negative emotions such as anger or frustration in a violent way. The thesis treated official accounts of Exclusion from school in Scotland as data, which showed conceptual and explanatory problems that emerge from a 'behaviourist' approach as unable to explain the gendered character of in/discipline or Exclusion. Official account treat gender in essentialist ways as largely 'taken for granted' and as not having explanatory relevance. A critical examination of relevant textual, interview and observational data indicates that current educational practice, informed by the principle of 'learning needs', is officially presented as a positivist 'monologue' that effectively 'individualises' problems of in/discipline at school. Positivist categories effectively limit education's ability to account for normative character of schools and schooling as gendered 'social worlds'.

Official accounts conceptualise 'discipline' and 'rationality' as 'objective' measures of a system's capacity to function according to its normative expectations of pupils organised by st/age. Constructed in the language of system categories, general accounts present and measure pupils, teachers and schools in terms of their 'performance'. Official categories, for example 'attainment' in formal examinations, is used as a reliable measure of 'effective education'. The non-reflexive character of such categories effectively discounts pupils' achievements in education. The thesis argues that government school league tables are criticisable measures of pupils' or

schools' 'performance' because such measures largely 'take for granted' the evenness of educational provision and the conditions in which children learn. Government have justified differential allocation of material and professional resources on the basis of such measures, to present pupils with differential and unequal access to 'educational opportunity'. Despite official recognition that pupils experience emotional, cognitive and social problems beyond their control, problems of in/discipline are officially and professionally attributed largely to personal choice in failing to accept a school's normative expectations of pupils to attend, to behave and to attain at school. Such pupils and by extension their teachers and schools, are deemed to have 'failed' to meet the system's 'rationally' assessed standards. Actual engagement with participants showed 'ethical practice' and 'informed consent' as on-going issues in interaction that required continual negotiation throughout the research process, which drew attention to the inadequacy of 'behaviourist' and 'positivist' accounts of Exclusion.

The thesis outlines problems associated with establishing a coherent fit between the research problem, its questions and research design with sufficient scope for an adequate exploration of its research questions. Feminist sociological theory, consistent with social experience conceptualised as 'negotiated order', argued that qualitative methods of social inquiry were particularly effective in allowing girls and women to articulate a critique of girls discriminatory treatment relative to boys in education. Drawing upon qualitative methods of research, this thesis presents a reflexive account that includes of girls' and boys' accounts of actions that do not 'fit' with education's normative expectations of pupils (Delamont 2000). I examined pupils and teachers reported interactions at school through their concept of 'in trouble', which revealed the normative character of labelling and the socially constructive effect of labels used at school. I present meanings at school as negotiated among actors, to a greater or lesser extent, by reference to essentialist ideas of 'masculinity' and 'femininity'. I argue essentialist meanings associated with these concepts are used as normative referents by pupils in everyday interactions among peers and with their teachers, thus constraining interaction among boys and girls according to gender specific rules/norms. Pupils *and* teachers discussions about talk/action shows in/discipline as a problem of rationality encountered among pupils and among learners/teachers who witness and discuss action officially defined as 'bad' behaviour (Mac an Ghail 1996: 151).

Rationality, rules and negotiated order

The thesis argues that a 'discursive' approach to in/discipline facilitates theoretical linking between 'self', the social, and ultimately the cultural production and reproduction of society (Habermas 1987: 113-190). An examination of relevant official accounts of in/discipline and Exclusion found that compulsory schooling is constituted within discursive worlds that are linked by discussions, for example about problems of in/discipline and Exclusion from education. A less well-articulated educational discourse, for example emerges from pupils who describe emergent problems. Pupils as interlocutors are able to criticise the validity and reliability of teachers' claims (Habermas 1987). In comparison to pupils, educational professionals, arguably powerful in knowing and making decisions about what and how to teach have a more authoritative voice, which is heard within consultative discourses with local education authorities. The latter consult with government policy makers. Officials are materially powerful in that they make decisions about the conditions in which teaching/learning is experienced. The thesis makes empirical links at each of these levels of analysis through its analysis of actors' talk about talk/action within schools and schooling where discussion is constrained within educational rules and norms.

The thesis examined ways in which rules are conceptualised to find that meanings of rules and social norms are necessarily negotiated in interaction. Durkheim argues in disputes about rules and regulations,

... judgement must be made according to the ethics of the time, since that is what the rules express (Durkheim 1984: 13).

Durkheim's reference to 'judgement' of action considered to be appropriate in social life draws attention to 'social order' as a 'moral order', which is conveyed in the language of 'should' and 'ought' (Goffman 1972; Crossley 1986), thus school rules and regulations normatively order conditions within which pupils are expected to learn and achieve. The thesis presents a reflexive account of in/discipline at school to argue that schools and schooling are 'negotiated orders' constituted in everyday talk.

Although constrained within formal rules of education, participants' accounts show everyday 'encounters' at school to be special in Goffman's sense. The thesis drew upon Goffman's 'presentation of everyday self' to draw out actors' desires to 'keep

face' among pupils and between teachers and pupils, in public and private interactions. Habermas argues that 'interaction' is a basic unit of social inquiry, a theoretical position the thesis ultimately used to examine pupils' and teachers' reports of schooling. The thesis considers 'rationality' and 'discipline' as characteristics of a social situation, 'intersubjectively' produced by actors in so far as they resolve problems through reaching mutual agreement (Habermas 1987: 113-190). Exclusion offers a concrete example of pupils' and teachers' failure to reach mutual agreement over learning.

Summary of Findings

Despite teachers' denial that gender is constitutive of Exclusion and/or in/discipline at school, evidence from one school showed that within a school year the overwhelming number of pupils Excluded were boys. The thesis concludes that Exclusion is an outcome of a pupil's inability and/or lack of desire to negotiate his/her 'school relations' according to teachers' normative expectations of young people to act 'like a pupil', to argue that girls are most likely to interact in ways that 'fit' with teachers' expectations of pupils.

Reputations

Within specific material and geographical constraints, 'reputations' at school are created at the level of discussion about talk/action as actors reach agreement about learning/teaching. Theoretically, in discursively produced 'social worlds' 'we do things with words', an empirically significant point evidenced in pupils' accounts of their desire to 'fit in' socially at school. I present data showing a pupil's reputation is understood to reflect his/her social acceptance or rejection *at* school and *of* school, which had formal significance as teachers knew and referred to pupils by reputation. Pupils qualified a reputation as 'good' or 'bad', which suggests reputations reflect the moral order of their 'social worlds' and thus provide the normative referents of those relations. In everyday talk about people at school pupils and teachers referred to others by reputation, which had a social effect in that a person became known according to the general characteristics of a reputation. Reputations emerged as a social response to an individual and his/her actions, an important distinction that reflects a reputation as socially complex. Reputations were understood as essentialist statements of a person as 'being', and as a collective's normative judgement of a person as 'doing'. Due to their socially

ascribed character a reputation is largely beyond an individual's personal control, for example pupils feared acquiring a 'sad' reputation.

Pupils' discussions about reputations indicated that boys are most concerned to have a 'good' reputation among boys, whereas girls are concerned to have a 'good' reputation among girls and boys, as a 'sound' or trustworthy person. Pupils' were fearful of gaining a negative reputation, for example a boy did not want to gain a socially denigrated reputation as a 'poof', which led to problems of bullying among boys. Meanwhile, girls generally fear gaining a negative reputation as a 'slag', which has negative social effects among girls and boys. Among pupils directly involved in the research were two pupils who exemplified the personal *and* social significance of reputations at school; one boy and one girl claimed their experience of emotional and physical bullying by other pupils had led to a suicide attempt. Being known by a reputation was reported as more likely to have negative than positive social effects, for example if a person's reputation suggested his/her membership of a socially denigrated grouping. Overtures of sociability from pupils' with denigrated reputations as 'fighters' or 'skivers' are generally socially unacceptable, thus membership of new social networks is difficult to achieve.

Pupils' social interactions

The thesis interrogated pupils' reported and observed experiences at school through the concept of 'in trouble', which show pupils define action as 'bad' behaviour, for example 'fighting' or 'skiving' by reference to educational and/or gender norms. Pupils' descriptions of pupil interactions led to the conceptualisation of 'fighting' or 'skiving' as 'communicative action', which show actors meanings as nuanced according to the normative perspectives of social audiences at school. Despite pupils claims for gender equality, 'fighting' among girls has a more immediate negative social effect on girls who 'fight' as they are morally denigrated, whilst social acceptance among boys is necessarily constrained within normative expectations that boys convey a social impression of having a *capacity* to 'fight'. A pupil who 'skived' generally gained a 'bad' reputation among pupils and teachers, but pupils argued girls were more likely to 'skive' than boys, which is explained in terms of gendered expectation of girls to 'withdraw' from stressful situations. In contrast, boys are normatively expected not to 'withdraw' but to act in ways that demonstrate an appropriate degree of 'hardness' (Askew & Ross 1988: 17).

The thesis argues that gaining a socially acceptable 'self' among boys, evidenced in the way that a boy interacts with other boys, constrains boys according to normative expectations that **have a greater potential** for Exclusion. Conversely, gaining a socially acceptable 'self' among girls, evidenced in the way that a girl generally interacts with girls or boys, constrains girls according to normative expectations that **have a lesser potential** for Exclusion. Thus for boys social acceptance among boys requires a 'normal' public display that is generally more boisterous, whereas social acceptance for girls requires a 'normal' public display of co-operation with everybody. The physicality of boys interactions thus have a greater potential to escalate out of control.

Pupils found it difficult to verbalise emotional responses to the physicality of others for fear of sounding discriminatory, for example as snobby or racist or sexist. These feelings were clearly of social significance as young people described a range of visceral emotional responses to individuals, for example affection, annoyance and hate, in their claims that feelings influence social interactions across social spheres in negative and positive ways. Crossley is critical of Habermas' omission of emotion as an analytical category to argue that 'communicative action'. "... is a process of mutual affecting in which interlocutors make emotional as well as cognitive appeal" (1998: 17). Pupils described pupils who manifest negative feelings by 'acting out' or 'withdrawing into self' as creating negative atmospheres in class that impact upon other pupils in terms of safety and comfort. In conditions of forced interaction, Habermas would argue that 'acting out' and 'withdrawing' exemplify 'distorted communications'.

Resolving dis/agreements and gender

Whilst pupils' described two common forms of resolving dis/agreements among them, 'talking it through' and 'fighting it out' as ways used by girls and boys, pupils' claims about talk/action oriented to resolving dis/agreements were normatively relativised by gender; pupils expect boys to 'fight it out' and girls to 'talk it through'. Pupils claim 'fighting it out' is a form of 'communicative action' that resolves dis/agreement, but ultimately 'fighting' or 'fighting talk' distinguished by its aggressive impact on others, leads to Exclusion. Pupils claim 'talking it through' is more likely to be chosen by girls relative to boys as a preferred form of 'communicative action', thus avoiding the risks of Exclusion. The latter form of 'communicative action' most closely reflects a 'speech act' situation and the

possibility of actors achieving rational agreement in interaction and inclusive social and educational outcomes. If, as pupils claim they do, girls 'talk it through' this suggests an explanation for why 'girls', as a general category, experience relatively greater social and academic success at school. Conversely, if, as pupils claim they do, 'boys' as a general social category, resolve dis/agreements by 'fighting it out' they are more likely to be subject to Exclusion, which is arguably exercised to secure the safety of the school community.

Teacher pupil interactions

Drawing upon teacher and pupil data, Mac an Ghaill discusses 'school relations' from within a 'traditional discourse' that separates 'discipline' from 'caring' (Ghaill 1994: 36 -40). Mac an Ghaill reports Wayne's view of gender and in/discipline in secondary school who says, "The bad kids give the school a bad reputation and the women teachers can't control them. It's like your mum and dad. You wouldn't expect your mum to take over your dad's job. It just doesn't look right" (1994: 37). Within this discourse 'discipline' and 'caring' are distinguished and explained by the concepts of 'masculine' and 'feminine'. This thesis presents 'discipline' as negotiated according to gendered rules of interaction, whilst according to those some rules 'caring' is expressed and extended towards pupils.

In this research pupils generally did not consider gender of a teacher important to them, but rather stressed that a 'good' teacher was one who treated them fairly and was interesting. Pupils described women teachers as more prepared to relate kindly and personally with pupils than male teachers. Problems of social and educational inclusion/exclusion among a socially differentiated pupil population necessarily emerge from the 'institutional' and 'gendered social' orders of everyday relations at school as mutually constituted in interaction.

Classroom interactions

This thesis argues that in the public domain of the class, tensions within formal interactions arise because pupils are concerned to keep face among peers, thus they prioritise informal relations and/or seek to obscure problems with learning, whilst teachers necessarily prioritise education, which rests upon teachers' expectations that pupils will/must focus upon learning. Teachers argue that pupils depend upon a teacher to exercise his/her rightful authority by keeping order and control in classrooms.

The thesis demonstrates that co-operative relations among teacher and pupils emerge as a socially produced resource from within classroom interactions, characterised by mutual respect and a more discursive negotiation of actors meanings and intentions. In contrast, co-ercive relations among teacher and pupils emerge as a failure of actors to establish sufficient agreement to 'get on with school work', characterised by a lack of respect and a relatively excessive use of sanctions and punishments. The thesis presents examples of 'yuffty' classed and 'student' teacher classes, which illuminated the gendered nuances of process within these kind of teacher/learner relations. Pupils and teachers suggest that less socially and/or professionally competent teachers show a greater reliance upon threat or exercise of sanctions and punishments to achieve 'institutional order', which was reflected in a class as a 'bad' atmosphere.

The thesis argues that teachers drew upon essentialist understandings of gender to explain differences among pupils' capacity and willingness to accept the demands of schooling, to suggest girls were more 'mature' than boys of the same st/age. Teachers and pupils reported a 'good' pupil reputation among teachers as emerging from teachers' perceptions of a pupil's 'academic ability'. Teachers described pupils' experiences resulting from 'academic failure' as followed by a strong desire to escape those situations. Whilst teachers are fearful that under stress boys' interactions lead to dis/order in classrooms, in contrast teachers' observed that girls in stressful interactions 'withdraw into self', either in class or by 'truanting'. Teachers report that pupils who are not able to 'keep up' academically due to more basic reading, writing or numeracy problems are 'extracted' from mainstream classrooms for learning support, and that not being able to 'keep up' academically with peers leads boys to fool around socially in order to cover up their academic inability. Girls are reported as 'chatting', a form of in/discipline that is experienced as less threatening to formal order. Teachers 'send' or 'take' out pupils who 'act out' in class, which has two negative outcomes; he/she falls behind in terms of learning, but of greatest social significance, such a person is certainly not considered by pupils as 'cool', and is possibly denigrated as a 'radge'.

The thesis indicates that teachers' normative referents vary according the extent to which they strike a balance between their professional obligations as constrained within 'performance discourses' and their desire and ability to relate to pupils on a more personal level as reflected in the way that they respond to problems of in/discipline. Teachers cannot 'talk it through' in a class; here he/she is forced to

use formal rules as 'applied' rather than as 'communicated' thus constraining the likelihood of reaching rational agreement.

A number of contradictions emerge from teacher data given the greater likelihood of boys Exclusion. In both schools, female teachers stated a preference for teaching boys, especially 'bad' boys, and teachers generally report extending a greater degree of licence towards 'joking' and 'poor school work' among boys. Whilst male teachers stated a preference for teaching girls, because girls were largely more co-operative than boys, 'chatting' and 'poor school work' among girls was largely ignored. Teachers and pupils described the ways that girls expressed anger, distress or boredom at school as largely less physically threatening to everyday social interactions. An outcome of teachers' differential expectations of girls compared with boys is that a girl's refusal to co-operate with a teacher's request was considered a moral failure on her part in contrast to similar refusals by boys, which was largely considered an extension of male bravado. Such a girl doubly offends against educational norms of the 'mature pupil' and gender norms as 'naturally' more co-operative as evidenced by teachers views that serious in/discipline among girls is "... worse than boys". This is explained in terms of teachers normative expectations that girls will naturally act more co-operatively relative to boys, thus teachers' everyday tolerance towards in/discipline among girls is relatively lower than it is for boys. Despite women teachers' less generous views of girls, as 'huffy' and 'sneaky', girls' relative to 'boys' continue to negotiate 'school relations' more successfully than 'boys' as evidenced by a gradual climb in academic outcomes since the end of 1970's (McPherson 1992) and a relatively lower rate of Exclusion among girls.

Despite women teachers' expressed feelings of pleasure towards or at least of tolerance of boys stereotyped as 'badly behaved', boys emerge must negotiate positive social relations among boys in order to maintain their physical and emotional safety among boys. Showing an interest in learning does not enhance a boy's reputation unless it is well matched by his social acceptance among boys. Pupils and teachers report interactions between **boys not motivated to learn and many male teachers** a matter of social as well as individual concern (Rattansi 1992: 27 - 28; Mac an Ghail 1988). In conditions of limited material and professional resources, data show that some teachers draw a distinction among pupils as 'deserving' or 'non-deserving' as evidenced by his/her reputation of additional costs entailed in supporting him/her at school. Boys relative to girls are more frequently

defined in terms of the latter category, which data suggest refers to those boys who are 'less academically able' and/or not interested in learning (Rosser and Harré 1976). Nevertheless, data show pupils depend upon the support of a network of teachers with sufficient time and energy to give continued extra support, which is likely to be given to a pupil who is sufficiently liked and 'academically able' and shows some positive feelings towards learning.

Implications of the research.

The thesis recognises attempts by policy makers and educationalists to provide pupils with 'equality of opportunity' to state education according to his/her 'learning needs'. However a normative aspiration of a democratic state education, 'equality of opportunity' according to a pupil's 'learning needs', is largely replaced by an emphasis on 'performance', which has discriminatory effects upon those who, for a range of reasons, do not 'perform' well academically. The thesis has explained why, as a category, 'boys' are more successful in terms of Exclusion than 'performance'.

Discriminatory treatment of pupils explained by reference to class, ethnicity and gender as conventionally understood, did not emerge as categories adequate to explain Exclusion, as teachers *and* pupils explained one pupil's treatment at school in terms of classism, racism and/or sexism only to describe another pupil of the same gender from a similar social and/or racial background as treated extremely positively. Unlike Stanworth (1981: 42), who noted that pupils did not interpret differential treatment as sexual discrimination, pupils in this research did interpret some teachers responses towards them as sexist. Rory certainly did. Mahmood and Rhona were not sure if their negative treatment by a teacher was racist. Rattansi argues that in conditions where actors feel ambivalent about their desire to participate (and pupils exercise a choice not to participate for reasons that they can defend) one cannot pose "... teacher stereotypes of black pupils as supposedly translated into discriminatory practices that lead to unequal outcomes" (1992: 49). Matthew and Jessie exemplify pupils whose choices about learning were severely constrained by pressing social considerations.

Sociology of education has long argued labelling has a discriminatory effect on pupils 'in trouble' in terms of educational provision. Labels used by officials and professionals to describe and group pupils is an inevitable outcome of education's mass and compulsory character (Paterson 1983; McPherson 1992), but the thesis has

outlined their normative character as shaping and reflecting actors interactions at school. The thesis has linked theoretical insights to examples of 'distorted communications' among pupils and their teachers, in which pupils seek to avoid 'loss of face', either academically or socially, among socially differentiated peer groupings. Whilst teachers are similarly concerned, their interactions with pupils are shown as constrained within professional demands and official time-tables. Although such conversations themselves may be negatively interpreted within normative 'gender relations' (Mac an Ghaill 1994: 174), teachers and pupils need flexible time and a private place to 'talk through' dis/agreements.

The question that policy-makers must address is to what extent do conditions at school allow for 'ideal speech acts'? Chapter Eight described two main ways that pupils are Excluded from school: as a dramatic 'event' or as an 'event' in a process that reflects a pupil's inclusion in a range of supportive strategies (Booth 1996). Analysis of individual Exclusion records could reveal whether one 'route' is more 'gendered' than the other, but further research is required into the *character of dis/agreements* between teachers and pupils of the same gender, similarly into *character of dis/agreements* among pupils of the same gender.

Official and government support of classroom relations, for example by smaller class sizes, is crucial, but this thesis argues that a key basis of teacher/learner relations is mutual trust between interlocutors. Policy-making decisions must reflect attempts to recognise the complexity of formal relations, to allow for the fact that trust cannot be imposed. Pupils can only speak when they are ready and to whom they trust, which in practice means that person may not necessarily be officially designated as a guidance teacher. Currently it is the case that 'performance' is a measure of education's 'rationality', which leads to pupils' and teachers' 'punishment' for 'failing' in terms of 'performance'. Policy-makers need to re-conceptualise education as an 'rational' outcome of 'negotiated relations' and seek to provide greater support for teacher/pupil and pupil/pupil relations. Crossley notes Habermas' view that, "Rationality as 'communicative action' produces agreement among social actors to the extent that it is overridden by economic and political power" (Crossley 1998: 17 -18).

At the end of observing a class, I witnessed at close hand a boy requesting a male teacher to sign his 'behaviour sheet'. Earlier, a woman teacher had described the boy as, " ... not an able boy". The male teacher's tone of voice was harsh as he questioned

the boy about his work. The boy's face wore a strained expression; half fear and half defiance. As I watched I experienced a strong negative feeling in my stomach. I did not like how I felt, hearing and watching the encounter. I felt a strong desire to 'speak up' for the boy. I wouldn't have liked to be spoken to in such a disrespectful way. A few days later I saw the same S3 boy quietly talking to another boy about a friend who had been Excluded from school and sent to a special school. My ears pricked up as the boy said to his friend, " ... and do you get to come back?" I wanted to say 'No, not unless you are very lucky. And the anger lasts for years.'

Bibliography

- Alanen, L. 1992. *Modern Childhood? Exploring the Child Question in Sociology*. Jyvaskyla: University of Jyvaskyla.
- Alanen, L. 1995. 'Children and the Institutional Order: Constraints and competences' Children and Social Competence Conference. University of Surrey: unpublished paper.
- Alderson, P. 1995. *Listening to Children: Children, ethics and social research*. Ilford: Barnardos.
- Anderson, J. 1995. 'Translator's Introduction' in Honneth, A. *The Struggle for Recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Archer, M.S. 1984. *Social Origins of Educational Systems: University Edition*. London: Sage Publications.
- Arshad, R. 1992. 'The Inter-Connections of Gender, Class and Ethnicity within Educational Contexts' in Brown, S. and Riddell, S. (eds.) *Class, Race and Gender in Schools*. Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education.
- Arshad, R. and Diniz, F.A. 1999 'Race Equality in Scottish Education' in Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. (eds.) *Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Askew, S. and Ross, C. 1988. *Boys Don't Cry: Boys and sexism in education*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Ball, S.J. 1981. *Beachside Comprehensive: A case-study of secondary schooling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ball, S.J. 1987. *The Micro Politics of the School: Towards a theory of school organization*. London: Routledge.
- Ball, S.J., Bowe, R. and Gerwitz, S. 1994. *Market Forces and Parental choice*. London: IPPR/Rivers Oram Press.
- Ball, S.J., Bowe, R. and Gewirtz, S. 1995. 'Circuits of Schooling: A sociological exploration of parental choice of school in social-class contexts'. *The Sociological Review* vol. 43: 52-78.
- Bamford, C. 1988. 'Gender and Education in Scotland: A review of research'. Edinburgh: Scottish Institute Adult and Continuing Education.
- Barrett, M. 1980. *Women's Oppression Today*. London: NBL/Verso.
- Barnes, B. 1995. *The Elements of Social Theory*. London: UCL Press Ltd.
- Barnes, J.A. 1979. *Who Should Know What? Social Science, Privacy and Ethics*: Penguin Education.
- Barton, L. 1986. 'The politics of special educational needs', *Disability Handicap And Society*, Issue1 vol. 3: 273-290.

Baudrillard, J. 1987. *The Ecstasy of Communication*: New York: Semiotext(e) Inc.

Becker, H.S. 1963. *Outsiders*. New York: The Free Press.

Becker, H.S. (ed.) 1964 *The Other Side: Perspectives on deviance*. New York and London: Free Press.

Becker, H.S. [1952] 'Social class variations in the teacher-pupil relationship' in Cosin, B.R., Dale, I.R., Esland, G.M. and Swift, D.E. (eds.) 1971. *School and Society*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bell, C. and Roberts, H. 1984. *Social Researching Politics, Problems, Practice*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bem, S. 1977. 'On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny'. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 45: 166-205.

Bennett, A. 1999. 'Subcultures or Neo-Tribes? Rethinking the relationship between youth, style and musical tastes'. *Sociology* 33: 599 - 617.

Benyon, J. 1989. 'A School for Men': An ethnographic study of routine violence in schooling' in Walker, S. and Barton, L. (eds.) *Politics and Processes of Schooling*. Milton Keynes and Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Berger, P.L., Berger, B. and Kellner, H. 1973. *The Homeless Mind: Modernisation and consciousness*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Betteridge, D. 1999. 'Personal and Social Education' in Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. (eds.) *Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Blauner, B. 1996. 'Review Essay of Masculinities' *Contemporary Sociology*. 2: 166 - 168.

Bloor, D. 1997. *Wittgenstein, Rules and Institutions*. London New York: Routledge.

Blumer, H. 1962. 'Society as Symbolic Interaction' in Rose, A.M. (ed.) *Human Behaviour and Social Processes: An interactionist approach*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Blyth, E. and Milner, J. 1996. *Exclusion From School*. London: Routledge.

Bonner, K.M. 1990. 'Motivation and the desire to learn'. *Dianoia* Spring 18: 18 -35.

Booth, T. and Swann, W. (eds.) 1992. *Policies for Diversity in Education*, London: Routledge.

Booth, T. 1996. 'Stories of Exclusion: natural and unnatural selection' in Blyth, E. and Milner, J. (eds.) *Exclusion From School*. London: Routledge.

Boudon, R. 1974. *Education, Opportunity and Social Inequality*. New York: Wiley.

Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J.C. 1990. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London, Newbury Park, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Boyd, B. 1999. 'Scottish School Pupils: characteristics and influences' in Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. (eds.) *Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Brah, A. and Minhas, R. 1985. 'Structural Racism or Cultural Difference?' in Weiner, G. (ed.) *Just a Bunch of Girls*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Braithwaite, J. 1989. *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brake, M. 1980. *Sociology of Youth Culture and Youth Subcultures*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Brannen, J. and O'Brien, M. 1995. 'Childhood and the Sociological Gaze: Paradigms and Paradoxes'. *Sociology* vol.29: 729-737.
- Brannen, J. and O'Brien, M. 1996. *Children in Families: Research and policy*. London: Falmer Press.
- Brodie, I. 1998. *Exclusion from school: Highlight No. 161*. London: National Children's Bureau/Barnardos.
- Brown, P. 1987. *Schooling Ordinary Kids: Inequality, unemployment and the new vocationalism*. London and New York: Tavistock Publications.
- Brown, P. 1990. 'The 'Third Wave': Education and the ideology of parentocracy'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* . 11: 65 -85.
- Brown, S. and McIntyre, D. 1993. *Making Sense of Teaching*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Brown, S. and Riddell, S. 1992. *Class, Race and Gender in Schools*. SCRE. Glasgow: GNP Booth.
- Bryant, I. Burnhill, P.M., Lamb, J.M. and Raffe, D. 1985. *Report on the 1984 Pilot of the Scottish Young Peoples Survey*, Centre for Educational Sociology:University of Edinburgh.
- Bryce, T.G.K. 1996. 'Constructivism, Knowledge and National Science Targets'. *Scottish Educational Review* vol. 25: 87-96.
- Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. 1999. 'Scottish Secondary Education: Philosophy and Practice' in Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. (eds.) *Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bryman, A. 1988. *Quantity and Quality in Social Research*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Budgeon, S. 1997. 'The Self-identity of Young Women: Fashion magazines and the 'project of self.' in *Social Contexts of Childhood and Youth*. University of Hull: 1-25
- Burgess, R.G. 1983. *Experiencing Comprehensive Education: A study of Bishop McGregor School*. London New York: Methuen.
- Burgess, R.G. 1984. *In the Field: An introduction to field research*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Burnhill, P., McPherson, A., Raffe, D. and Tomes, N. 1987. 'Constructing a Public Account of an Educational System' in Walford, G. (ed.) *Doing Sociology of Education*. Lewes: Falmer.

- Burr, V. 1995. *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Carlen, P., Gleeson, D. and Wardhaugh, J. 1992. *Truancy: The politics of compulsory schooling*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Carrigan, T., Connell, R.W. and Lee, J. 1985. 'Towards a new sociology of masculinity'. *Theory and Society* vol.14, (5): 551-604.
- Central Statistical Office 1999. *Social Trends*. vol. 29: 58.
- Cicourel, A.V., Jennings, K.H., Jennings, S.H.M., Leiter, K.C.W., Mackay, R., Mehan, H. and Roth, D.H. 1974. *Language Use and School Performance*. New York: Academic Press:
- Clark, M. 1997. 'Education in Scotland: setting the scene' in Clark, M. and Munn, P. (eds.) *Education in Scotland: Policy and practice from pre-school to secondary*. London: Routledge.
- Coard, B. 1971. *How the West Indian Child is Made Educationally Subnormal in the British School System*. London: New Beacon Books.
- Cohen, R. and Hughes, M. (with Ashworth, L. and Blair, M.) 1994. *School's out: The family perspective on exclusion*, London: FamilyService Units, Barnardos.
- Connell, R.W. 1983. 'The porpoise and the elephant: Birmingham on class, culture and education' in *Which way is up? Essays on class, sex and culture*. Sydney and London: Allen and Unwin.
- Connell, R.W. 1985a. 'Theorising Gender'. *Sociology* 19: 260-272.
- Connell, R.W. 1985b. *Teachers' Work*. Sydney London Boston: Allen and Unwin.
- Connell, R.W. 1987. *Gender and Power*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Connell, R.W. 1993a. 'Cool Guys, Swots and Wimps: The interplay of masculinity and education' in Lawrence, A. (ed.) *Education, Inequality and Social Identity*. London: Falmer Press.
- Connell, R.W. 1993b. 'Special Issue: Masculinities' in *Theory and Society*, vol.22 (5).
- Connell, R.W. 1996. 'Response to Review Essays on Masculinities'. *Contemporary Sociology* 25: 172- 174.
- Connell, R.W. 1996. 'Teaching the Boys: New research on masculinity, and gender strategies for schools'. *Teachers College Record* 98: 206-235.
- Connolly, P. 1997. 'In Search of Authenticity: Researching young children's perspectives' in Pollard, A. (ed.) *Children and Their Curriculum*. London: Falmer Press.
- Cook, J.A. and Fonow, M.M. 1986. 'Knowledge & Women's Interests: Issues of Epistemology & Methodology in Feminist Sociological Research' in *Sociological Inquiry*. vol. 56 (Winter): 2-29.

Cooper, P. 1993. *Effective Schools for Disaffected students: Integration and segregation*. London: Routledge.

Crossley, N. 1998. 'Emotion and Communicative Action: Habermas, linguistic philosophy and existentialism' in Williams, S.J. and Bendelow, G. (eds.) *Emotions in Social Life: Critical themes and contemporary issues*. London New York: Routledge.

Croxford, L. 1999. 'League Tables -Who needs them?' . Edinburgh: Centre for Educational Sociology.

Cullen, M.A. and Lloyd, G. 1996. 'Alternative Education Provision for Excluded Pupils: A Literature Review'. Edinburgh: Moray House Institute of Education, Heriot-Watt University.

Cullen, M.A., Johnstone, M., Lloyd, G. and Munn, P. 1996a. 'Exclusions from School and Alternatives: Education authority policy and procedures' . Edinburgh: Moray House Institute of Education.

Cullen, M.A., Johnstone, M., Lloyd, G. and Munn, P. 1996b. 'Exclusions from School and Alternatives: Report on Phase 3: The Case Studies' . Edinburgh: Moray House Institute of Education.

Cullen, M.A., Johnstone, M., Lloyd, G. and Munn, P. 1996c. 'Exclusions from School and Alternatives: The Headteachers' Perspective' . Edinburgh: Moray House Institute of Education.

Cullingford, C. and Morrison, J. 1997. 'Peer Group Pressure Within and Outside the School'. *British Educational Research Journal* vol. 23: 61 -80.

Dawe, A. 1970. 'The Two Sociologies'.*British Journal of Sociology*. vol. 21: 207-218.

de Beauvoir, S. 1949. *The Second Sex*. England: Penguin Modern Classics.

Delamont, D. 1983. (2nd. ed.) London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.

Delamont, S. 1992. *Fieldwork in Educational Settings: Methods, pitfalls and perspectives*. London: The Falmer Press.

Delamont, S. 2000. 'The Anomalous Beast: Hooligans and the Sociology of Education'. *Sociology* vol. 34: 95 - 111.

Denzin, N.K. 1989. *Interpretive Interactionism*. USA.: Sage Publications Inc.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.S. 1994. (eds.)*Handbook of Qualitative Research*. USA: Sage Publications Inc.

Department for Education. 1994. 'Pupils with Problems'. London: DFE.

Department for Education. 1994a. 'Circular 9/94: Education of Children with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties'. London: DFE.

Department for Education. 1994b. 'Circular 10/94: Exclusions from School.' London: DFE.

- Department for Education. 1995. 'National Survey of Local Education Authorities' Policies and Procedures for the Identification of and Provision for, Children Who Are Out of School by Reason of Exclusion or Otherwise'. London: DFE.
- Department for Education and Employment. 1999. 'Social Inclusion: Pupil Support'. London: DfEE.
- Dockrell, W.B., Dunn, W.R. and Milne, A. 1978. 'Special Education in Scotland'. Edinburgh: Scottish council for Research in Education (SCRE).
- Donald, P., Gosling, S. and Hamilton, J. 1994. "'No problem here": action research against racism in a mainly white area." . Glasgow: SERA.
- Downes, D. and Rock, P. 1995. (2nd ed) *Understanding Deviance*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Downes, D. and Rock, P. 1998. (3rd ed) *Understanding Deviance*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Durkheim, E. 1938. *The Rules of Sociological Method*. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Durkheim, E. 1925 *L'education morale*, Paris: Libraire Felix Alcan.
- Durkheim, E. 1961. *Moral Education: A Study in the theory and application of the sociology of education*. New York: Free Press.
- Durkheim, E. 1972 [1950]. 'Definition of political society and the state' in Giddens, A. (ed.) *Emile Durkheim: Selected Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:
- Durkheim, E. 1972. 'The 'normal' and the 'pathological' in Giddens, A. (ed.) *Emile Durkheim: Selected Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Durkheim, E. 1984b. 'Preface to the Second Edition: The Division of Labour in Society' in Coser, L. (ed.) *The Division of Labour in Society*. London: Macmillan.
- Eichler, M. 1988. *Nonsexist research methods: A practical guide*. Boston [Mass.] London: Allen and Unwin.
- Elton Report, 1989. 'Discipline in schools'. London: DES.
- Emler, N. and Reicher, S. 1995. *Adolescence and Delinquency*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Epstein, D., Elwood, J., Hey, V. and Janet Maw 1998. (eds.) *Failing Boys? Issues in gender and achievement*. Buckingham Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Erikson, E.H. (1950) *Childhood and Society*. London: Imago.
- Evans, M. 1987. *Jane Austen and The State*. London and New York: Tavistock Publications.
- Finch, J. 1993. 'Conceptualising Gender' in Morgan, D. and Stanley, L. (eds.) *Debates in Sociology*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Finn, G.P.T. 1999. 'Sectarianism' and Scottish Education'. in Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. (eds.) *Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Fortin, L. and Bigras, M. 1997. 'Risk Factors Exposing Young Children to Behaviour Problems'. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* (AWCEBD) vol.2. Spring.
- Freund, P.E.S. 1998. 'Social Performances and their Discontents: The biopsychosocial aspects of dramaturgical stress' in Williams, S.J. and Bendelow, G. (eds.) *Emotions in Social Life: Critical themes and contemporary issues*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Furlong, A. and Cartmel, F. 1997. *Young People and Social Change: Individualisation and risk in late modernity*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Furlong, V.J. 1991. 'Disaffected Pupils: reconstructing the sociological perspective'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 12: 293-307.
- Galloway, D., Ball, T., Blomfield, D. and Seyd, R. 1982. *Schools and Disruptive Pupils*. London New York: Longman.
- Gagnon, J.H. and Simon, W. 1974. *Sexual Conduct: The social sources of human sexuality*. London: Hutchinson.
- Garfinkel, H. 1956. 'Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies'. *American Journal of Sociology* vol. 61: 420 - 424.
- Garfinkel, H. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Ghail, M.M.a. 1988. *Young Gifted and Black: Student-teacher relations in the schooling of black youth*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Ghail, M.M.a. 1994. *Making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ghail, M.M.a. 1996. "What about the boys?": schooling, class and crisis masculinity'. *Sociological Review* 44: 381-397.
- Giddens, A. 1984. *Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. 1989. *Sociology*. Oxford and Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell.
- Giddens, A. 1995. *Sociology*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Ginsburg, H. 1972. 'The Myth of the Deprived Child' in Worsley, P., (ed) *Modern Sociology* (1978) Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Gitlin A, M.S.a.K.B. 1993. 'The Politics of Method: From a leftist ethnography to educative research' in Hammersley, M. (ed.) *Educational Research: Current Issues*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Goffman, E. 1956. 'The Nature of Deference and Demeanour'. *American Anthropologist* vol. 58: 47-85.
- Goffman, E. 1961. *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Goffman, E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. London: Pelican.

Goffman, E. 1963. *Stigma*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Goffman, E. 1967 [1955]. *Interaction Ritual*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. 1975. *Frame Analysis: An essay on the organisation of experience*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Goffman, E. 1977. 'The Arrangement Between the Sexes'. *Theory and Society* vol. 4: 301-331.

Gouldner, A. 1970. *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. London: Heinemann.

Gouldner, A.W. 1973 'The Sociologist as Partisan: sociology and the welfare state.' in *For Sociology: Renewal and critique in sociology today*. London: Allen Lane.

Gow, L. and McPherson, A. 1980. 'Tell them from me' . Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Gray, J., McPherson, A. and Raffe, D. 1983. *Reconstructions of Secondary Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Griffin, C. 1985. *Typical Girls: Young women from school to the market*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Griffiths, V. 1995. *Adolescent Girls and Their Friends. A feminist ethnography* . Aldershot: Atheneum Press Ltd.

Habermas, J. 1970. 'Towards a Theory of Communicative Competence' in Dreitzel, H.P. (ed.) *Recent Sociology No. 2: Patterns of Communicative Behaviour*. New York: Macmillan: 143-144.

Habermas, J. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the rationalization of society*. London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. 1987. 'Intermediate Reflections: system and lifeworld' in *Theory of Communicative Action: The critique of functionalist reason*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hall, S. 1992. 'New Ethnicities' in Donald, J. and Rattansi, A. (eds.) 'Race', *Culture and Difference*. London: Sage/Open University Press.

Hall, S. 1992. 'The question of cultural identity' in Hall, S., Held, D. and McGrew, T. (eds.) *Modernity and Its Futures*. Cambridge: Polity in association with Open University Press.

Hammersley, M. 1990. 'Pupil Culture and Classroom Order at Downtown' in Hammersley, M. (ed.) *Classroom Ethnography: Empirical and Methodological Essays*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hardman, C. 1973. 'Can there be an anthropology of children?' *Journal of Anthropological Society of Oxford*, vol. 7 (1): 85-99

Hargreaves, D.H. 1967. *Social Relations in a Secondary School*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

- Hargreaves, D.H., Hester, S.K. and Mellor, F.J. 1975. *Deviance in Classrooms*. London, Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hearn, J. 1996. 'Is masculinity dead? a critique of the concept of masculinity/masculinities' in Gaill, M.M.a. (ed.) *Understanding Masculinities*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Heritage, J. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hey, V. 1997. *The Company She Keeps*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- HMI 1978. 'The Education of Pupils with Learning Difficulties in Primary and Secondary Schools in Scotland: A Progress Report by HM Inspectors of Schools' . Edinburgh: The Scottish Office.
- HMI 1990. 'Choosing with Care - Provision for Pupils with Behavioural, Social and Emotional Difficulties' . Edinburgh: SED.
- HMI 1996. 'Examination Results in Scottish Schools 1994 -1996' . Edinburgh: SOEID.
- HMI 1997. 'Attendance and Absence in Scottish Schools in 1994/95 to 1996/97' Information for Parents. Edinburgh: IIM Inspectors of Schools (HMI) Audit Unit.
- HMI/Ofsted 1995/6. 'Exclusions from Secondary Schools' . London: Office of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools.
- HMSO 1995. 'The Kilbrandon Report: Children and Young Persons Scotland'. Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Hobbs, S. 1999. 'Disaffection with schooling' in Bryce and Humes (eds.) *Scottish Education* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Høeg, P. 1994. *Borderliners*. London: The Harvill Press.
- Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S. and Thompson, R. 1998. *The Male in the Head: Young People, heterosexuality and power*. London: The Tuffnell Press.
- Holmwood, J. 1995. 'Feminism and Epistemology: What Kind of Successor Science?'. *Sociology* vol. 29: 411-428.
- Holmwood, J. 1996. *Founding Sociology? Talcott Parsons and the idea of general theory*. Harlow: Longman Group Limited.
- Holmwood, J. and Stewart, A. 1991. 'Power and Normative Order' in *Explanation and Social Theory*. London: Macmillan.
- Honneth, A. 1995. 'Patterns of Intersubjective Recognition: Love, rights and solidarity' in *The Struggle for Recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Howe, C. 1996. *Gender and Classroom Interaction: A Research Review*. Edinburgh: SCRE.
- Howieson, C. and Semple, S. 1996. 'Guidance in Secondary Schools.' Edinburgh: Centre for Educational Sociology.

- Humes, W.M. and Paterson, H.M. 1983. (eds.) *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education 1800- 1980*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers.
- James, A. and Jenks, C. 1996. 'Public perceptions of childhood criminality'. *British Journal of Sociology* 47: 315-331.
- James, A. and Prout, A. 1990. (eds.) *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood*. London: Falmer Press.
- James, A. and Prout, A. 1996. 'Strategies and Structures : Towards a New Perspective on Children's Experiences of Family Life' in Brannen, J. and O'Brien, M. (eds.) *Children in Families: Research and policy*. London: Falmer Press.
- Jamieson, L. 1990. 'We all left at 14: Boys' and Girls' Schooling Circa 1900-1930' in Frewell, J. and Paterson, F. (eds.) *Girls in their Prime: Scottish education revisited*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Jamieson, L. 1997. 'Are Good Friends All you Need?' in *Sociology of Intimacy*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Janes, R.W. 1961. 'A note on the phases of the community role of the participant observer.'. *American Sociological Review* vol. 26: 446-450.
- Jenks, C. 1996. 'The Postmodern Child' in Brannen, J. and O'Brien, M. (eds.) *Children in Families: Research and policy*. London: Falmer Press.
- Keddie, N. 1971. 'Classroom Knowledge' in Worsley, P., (ed) *Modern Sociology* (1978: 2nd ed.) Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Lansdown, G. 1995. *Taking Part: Children's participation in decision making*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Lawn, M. and Ozga, J. 1988. 'The Educational Worker? A reassessment of teachers' in Ozga, J. (ed.) *Schoolwork: Approaches to the labour process of teaching*. Milton Keynes: Open University. Press.
- Lee, R.M. 1993. *Doing Research on Sensitive Topics*. London: Sage Ltd.
- Lees, S. 1993. *Sugar and Spice :Sexuality and adolescent girls*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Lloyd, G. 1992. 'Chosen with Care? Responses to Disturbing and Disruptive Behaviour' in Lloyd, G. and Watson, J. (eds.) *Meeting Special Educational Needs: A Scottish Perspective*. Edinburgh: Moray House Publications.
- Lloyd, G. and Padfield, P. 1995. *Reintegration into Mainstream? A Report on an investigation of the reintegration to school of children and young people with 'social emotional and behavioural difficulties'*. Edinburgh: Moray House Publications
- Lloyd, G. and Padfield, P. 1996. 'Reintegration into Mainstream? 'Gi'e us peace!'. *British Journal of Special Education* 23: 180-186.
- Lucey, V.W.H. 1989. *Democracy in the Kitchen: Regulating mothers and socialising daughters*. London: Virago.

- Lukes, S. 1974. *Power: A radical view*. Hong Kong: MacMillan.
- Lyotard, J. 1979. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report of Knowledge*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- MacBeath, J. 1988. *Personal and Social Education*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- MacBeath, J. 1999. 'School Effectiveness and School Improvement' in Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. (eds.) *Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- MacInnes, J. 1998. *The End of Masculinity*. Buckingham: Open University.
- MacIntosh, M. 1990. 'Caught between the two': Gender and race in a Scottish school' in Paterson, F. and Fewell, J. (eds.) *Girls in their Prime: the Scottish education tradition*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Majors, R., Gilborn, D. and Sewell, T. 1996. 'The exclusion of black children: implications for a racialised perspective'. *Multicultural Teaching* vol. 16: 35-37.
- Manning, P. 1992. *Erving Goffman and Modern Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Marr, R. and Marr, C.E. 1995. *Scots Education Law*. Edinburgh: W. Green and Son.
- Marriott, D. 1996. 'Reading Black Masculinities' in Ghaill, M.M.a. (ed.) *Understanding Masculinities*. Buckingham Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Marshall, T.H. and Bottomore, T. 1992. *Citizenship and Social Class*. London: Pluto Classic.
- Martino, W. 1999. 'Cool boys', 'Party Animals', 'Squids' and 'Poofters': Interrogating the dynamics and politics of adolescent masculinities in school.'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 20: 239 -263.
- Mayall, B. 1998. 'Children, emotions and daily life at home and school' in Williams, S.J. and Bendelow, G. (eds.) *Emotions in Social Life: Critical themes and contemporary issues*. London New York: Routledge.
- Mead, G. H. [1934] 1967. *Mind Self and Society*. London: University of Chicago Press.
- McCrone, D. 1998. *The Sociology of Nationalism: Tomorrows' Ancestors*. London: Routledge.
- McLaren, D. 1999. 'Guidance and Personal and Social Education in the Secondary School' in Bryce, T.G.K. (ed.) *Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McLean, A. 1987. 'After the belt: school processes in low-exclusion schools'. *School Organization* 7: 303-310.
- McLennan, G. 1995. 'Feminism, Epistemology and Postmodernism: Reflections on Current Ambivalence'. *Sociology* vol. 29: 391-409.
- McMahon, A. 1993. 'Male readings of feminist theory: the psychologisation of sexual politics in the masculinity literature' in *Theory and Society* vol.22: 675-96.

McPhee, H. 1992. 'Assessment - What is the Problem?' in Lloyd, G. (ed.) *Chosen with Care? Responses to disturbing and disruptive behaviour*. Edinburgh: Moray House Publications.

McPherson, A. 1983. 'An Angle on the Geist: persistence and change in the Scottish educational tradition' in Humes, W. and Paterson, H.M. (eds.) *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Limited.

McPherson, A. 1992. 'Schooling' in Dickson, A. and Treble, J.H. (eds.) *People and Society in Scotland*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd in Association with The Economic and Social History Society of Scotland.

McPherson, A. and Raab, C.D. 1988. *Governing Education, Sociology of Policy Since 1945*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

McRobbie, A. 1991. *Feminism and Youth Culture*. London: Macmillan.

McRobbie, A. and McCabe, T. (eds.) 1981. *Feminism for girls: an adventure story*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Mills, C.W. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. Chicago: Oxford University Press.

Mitchell, J. 1984. *Women: The Longest Revolution: Essays on feminism, literature and psychoanalysis*. London: Virago.

Mitchell, L. 1996. 'Effects of waiting time on excluded children' in Blyth, E. and Milner, J. (eds.) *Exclusion from School*. London and New York: Routledge.

Morgan, D.H.J. 1972. 'The British Association Scandal: the effect of publicity on a sociological investigation.' in *Sociological Review* . vol. 20, (2):185-206.

Morgan, D.L. 1988. *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications, INC.

Munn, P. 1994. 'The role of the learning support teacher in Scottish primary and secondary schools' in Riddell, S. and Brown, S. (eds.) *Special Educational Needs Policy in the 1990s*. London New York: Routledge.

Munn, P. 1999. 'Ethos and Discipline in the Secondary School' in Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. (eds.) *Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Munn, P. and Lloyd, G. 1998. 'Discipline in Schools. A Review of Extent, Causes and Cures.' Edinburgh: Moray House Institute of Education.

Munn, P., Cullen, M.A., Johnstone, M. and Lloyd, G. 1997. 'Exclusions and In-school Alternatives: Interchange No 47' . Edinburgh: Moray House Institute of Education, Heriot-Watt University.

Munn, P., Lloyd, G. and Cullen, M.A. 2000. *Alternatives to Exclusion from School*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Limited.

Normington, J. 1996. 'Exclusion from School: The role of outside agencies' in Blyth, E. and Milner, J. (eds.) *Exclusion from School: Interprofessional issues for policy and practice*. London New York: Routledge.

- O'Neil, J. 1994. *The Missing Child in Liberal Theory*. Toronto Buffalo London.
- Oakley, A. 1972. *Sex, Gender and Society*. London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd.
- Oakley, A. 1981. *Subject Women*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- OFSTED 1993. 'Education for Disaffected Pupils 1990-1992' . London: DFE.
- Ozga, J. 1988. *Schoolwork: Approaches to the labour process of teaching*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Packman, J. 1993. 'From Prevention to Partnership: Child Welfare Services Across Three Decades'. *Children and Society* vol. 7: 183-195.
- Padfield, P. 1995. *Reviewing the Literature: in search of the maladjusted*. MSc by Research, unpublished thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- Parsons, T. 1954. 'The professions and the social structure', in *Essays in Sociological Theory*, New York: Free Press.
- Parsons, C. 1999. *Education ,Exclusion and Citizenship*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Paterson, F.M.S. 1989. *Out of Place: Public policy and the emergence of truancy*. London: Falmer Press.
- Paterson, F.M.S. and Fewell, J. 1990. (eds.) *Girls in their Prime: Scottish education revisited*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Paterson, H.M. 1983. 'Incubus and Ideology: The development of secondary schooling in Scotland, 1900 - 1939' in Humes, W. and Paterson, H.M. (eds.) *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Limited.
- Paterson, L. 1993. 'Democracy and Curriculum in Scotland'. *Edinburgh Review*: 21-28.
- Peach, C. 1996. 'Ethnicity in the 1991 Census vol. 2' . London: HMSO.
- Peterson, S. 1992. 'Guidance' in Lloyd, G. (ed.) *Chosen with Care? Responses to disturbing and disruptive behaviour*. Edinburgh: Moray House Publications.
- Pickles, T. 1992. 'Youth Strategies in Scotland' in Lloyd, G. (ed.) *Chosen with Care? Responses to disturbing and disruptive behaviour*. Edinburgh: Moray House Publications.
- Pijl, S. and Meijer C. (1991) 'Does integration count for much? An analysis of the practices of integration in eight countries, *European Journal of Special Educational Needs* 6: 2.
- Pitkin, H.F. 1972. 'Language, learning and meaning' in *Wittgenstein and Justice*. Berkeley Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Plummer, K. 1982. 'Symbolic Interactionism and Sexual Conduct: an emergent perspective' in Brake, M. (ed.) *Human Sexual Relations: A reader in human sexuality*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

- Poster, M. 1988. *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings* . Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Powney, J. 1996. 'Trends in Gender Attainment in Scotland' . Edinburgh: SCRE.
- Prendergast, S. and Forrest, S. 1998. 'Shorties', 'low-lifers', 'hardnuts' and 'kings': Boys, emotions and embodiment in school' in *Emotions in Social Life: Critical themes and contemporary issues*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Pring, R. and Walford, G. 1997. *Affirming the Comprehensive Ideal*. London: Falmer Press.
- Pusey, M. 1988. *Jurgen Habermas*. London and New York: Tavistock Publications.
- Qvortrup, J. 1994. 'Childhood Matters: An introduction.' in Qvortrup, J., Bardy, M., Sgritta, G., and Wintersberger, H.(eds.) *Childhood Matters: Social Theory, Practice and Politics*, Aldershot: Avebury.
- Raffel, S.H. 1979. *Matters of Fact*. London, Boston and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Rattansi, A. 1992. 'Changing the Subject? Racism, Culture and Education' in Donald, J. and Rattansi, A. (eds.) *'Race', Culture and Difference*. London: Sage/Open University Press.
- Rawls, A.W. 1987. 'The interaction order sui generis: Goffman's contribution to social theory.' *Sociological Theory* vol. 5: 136-149.
- Reynolds, D. 1976a. 'Schools do make a difference'. *New Society* 29 July: 223-225.
- Reynolds, D. 1991. 'Doing educational research in Trelaw'. in Walford, G. (ed.) *Doing Educational Research*. London New York: Routledge.
- Rich, A. 1980. 'Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence.'. *Signs* 5: 631-660.
- Ricoeur, P. 1971. 'The Model of the Text: Meaningful action considered as text'. *Social Research* 38: 529- 562.
- Riddell, S. I. 1992. *Gender and The Politics of The Curriculum*. London: Routledge.
- Riddell, S. and Brown, S. 1994. *Special Educational Needs Policy in the 1990s: Warnock in the market place* . London: Routledge.
- Riddell, S. I. 1999. 'Gender and Scottish Education' in Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. (eds.) *Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Riessman, C.K. 1993. *Narrative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Robson, C. 1993. *Real World Research : A resource for social scientists and practitioner - researchers*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Roche, J. 1996. 'The Politics of Children's Rights' in Brannen, J. and O'Brien, M. (eds.) *Children in Families: Research and policy*. London: Falmer Press.

- Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. 1968. *Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Rosser, E. and Harré, R. 1976. 'The meaning of 'trouble'' in Hammersley, M. and Woods, P. (eds.) *The Process of Schooling*. London.
- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P. and Custon, J. 1979. *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and their Effects on Pupils*. London: Open Books.
- Schaffer, M. 1992. 'Children's Hearings and School Problems' in Lloyd, G. (ed.) *Chosen with Care? Responses to disturbing and disruptive behaviour*. Edinburgh: Moray House Publications.
- Scheff, T.J. 1966. *Being Mentally Ill: A sociological theory*. Chicago, London: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Scheff, T.J. 1988. 'Shame and Conformity: The Deference-Emotion System'. *American Sociological Review* vol. 53: 395 -406.
- Scottish Executive, 1999. 'The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry: An action plan for Scotland'. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Searle, J.R. 1995. *The Construction of Social Reality*. London: Penguin.
- SED 1968. 'Guidance in Scottish Secondary Schools' . Edinburgh: HMSO.
- SED 1971. 'The Structure of Promoted Posts in Secondary Schools in Scotland' . Edinburgh: HMSO.
- SED 1977. 'Truancy and indiscipline in schools in Scotland : The Pack Report'. Edinburgh: SED.
- SED 1989. 'Ethnically Based Statistics on School Pupils' . Edinburgh: Scottish Education Department.
- SED 1995. Teachers in Scottish Schools: September 1992. Edinburgh: Scottish Office.
- Segal, L. 1990. *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*. London: Virago.
- Seidler, V. 1994. *Unreasonable Men*. London: Routledge.
- Sewell, T. 1998. 'Loose canons: exploding the myth of the 'black macho' lad' in Epstein, D., Elwood, J., Hey, V. and Maw, J. (eds.) *Failing Boys? Issues in gender and achievement*. Buckingham Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Sharpe, S. 1994. *Just like a Girl: How girls learn to be women*. England: Penguin.
- Shaw, J. 1995. *Education ,Gender and Anxiety*. London: Taylor Francis.
- Silver, A. 1989. 'Friendship and trust as moral ideals: an historical approach'. *Archives Europeanes de Sociologie* xxx: 274-297.
- Silverman, D. 1993. *Interpreting Qualitative Data*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Smith, D.E. 1988. *The Everyday World As Problematic: A feminist sociology*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

SOED 1993a. 'Circular NO 10/93: Parents' Charter: Information to Parents' . Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education Department.

SOED 1993a. 'Personal and Social Development: 5 - 14' . Edinburgh: SOED.

SOED 1993b. 'Circular NO 12/93: Parents' Charter: Information for Parents: Special Schools' . Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education Department.

SOED 1993b. 'The Structure and Balance of the Curriculum: 5 - 14'. Edinburgh: SOED.

SOED 1995a. 'Circular No 1/95: Parents' Charter: Information For Parents: Authorised and Unauthorised Absence' . Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education Department.

SOED 1995b. 'Statistical Bulletin: Edn/D2/1995/5' . Edinburgh: Scottish Office.

SOEID 1995. 'Circular No 10/95: Parents' Charter: Information For Parents: Authorised and Unauthorised Absence' . Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education and Industry Department.

SOEID 1996. 'Circular No 10/96: 'Achievement For All': A Report On Selection Within Schools By H M Inspectors of Schools' . Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education and Industry Department.

SOEID 1996. 'How Good is Our School? Self Evaluation using Performance Indicators' . Edinburgh.

SOEID 1997a. 'Circular No 5/97: Reporting Incidences of Violence' . Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education and Industry Department.

SOEID 1997b. 'Draft Circular No /97: Guidance On Issues Concerning Exclusions From School' . Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education and Industry.

SOEID 1998. 'Circular No 2/98: Guidance on Issues Concerning Exclusion from School' . Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education and Industry Department.

SOEID 1998. 'Circular No 5/98: Reporting On School Performance Against Targets For Improvement in Standard and Higher Grade Attainment' . Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education and Industry Department.

SOEID 1999. 'Attendance and Absence in Scottish Schools: 1995/96 to 1997/98' : Scottish Office.

Spiel, O. 1962. *Discipline without Punishment*. London: Faber and Faber.

Spradley, J.P. 1980. *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Stanworth, M. 1981. *Gender and Schooling*. London: Hutchinson/Open University Press.

- Stirling, M. 1992b 'How many pupils are being excluded?' in *British Journal of Special Education*, 19, 4: 128 -130.
- Stoller, R.J. 1968. *Sex and Gender: On the Development of Masculinity and Femininity*. New York: Science House.
- Strauss, A. 1993. *Continual Permutations of Action*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Strauss, A.L. et al. 1964. *Psychiatric Ideologies and Institutions*. London New York: Free Press of Glencoe:
- Strong, J. 1918. *The Education Act*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.
- Sydie, R.A. 1987. *Natural Women, Cultured Men*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Tattum, D.P. 1982. *Disruptive Pupils in Schools and Units*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Tesch, R. 1990. *Qualitative Research: Analysis types and software tools*. London: Falmer Press.
- TESS 1994. 'New Rules on Exclusions' *Times Educational Supplement*.
- Thompson, E.P. 1991. *Customs in Common*. London: Penguin.
- Thompson, G.O.B., Stewart, M.E. and Ward, K.M. 1996. 'Criteria for Opening Record of Needs' . Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
- Thorne, B. 1993. 'Girls and Boys together... but mostly apart: Gender arrangements in Elementary Schools' in Wrigley, J. (ed.) *Education and Gender Equality*: London: Falmer Press.
- Thorne, B. and Luria, Z. 1986. 'Sexuality and Gender in Children's Daily Worlds'. *Social Problems* 33: 176-190.
- Tinkler, P. 1995. *Constructing Girlhood: Popular magazines for girls, growing up in England, 1920 - 1950*. London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- Tizard, B. and Phoenix, A. 1993. *Black White or Mixed Race? Race and racism in the lives of young people of mixed parentage*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tolson, A. 1977. *The Limits of Masculinity*. New York: Routledge.
- Tomlinson, S. 1982. *A Sociology of Special Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Turner, R. 1974. (ed.) *Ethnomethodology*. Aylesbury, Bucks: Penguin Education.
- Turner, E., Riddell, S. and Brown, S. 1995. *Gender Equality in Scottish Schools: the impact of recent educational reforms*. Manchester: Equal Opportunities Commission.
- Venables, P.H. 1980. 'The Report of a Working Party on Corporal Punishment in Schools'. Leicester: British Psychological Society.

Walby, S. 1990. *Theorizing Patriarchy*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Walford, G. 1991. (ed.) *Doing Educational Research*. London: Routledge.

Wallace, C., 1993. 'Reflections on the concept of "strategy" in Morgan, D. and Stanley, L. (eds.) *Debates in Sociology*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Warnock, H.M. 1978. 'Special Educational Needs: report to the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People' . London: DES.

Weiner, G., Arnot, M. and David, M. 1998. 'Is the Future Female? Female Success, Male Disadvantage, and Changing Gender Patterns in Education' in Halsey, A.H., Lauder, H., Brown, P. and Wells, A.S. (eds.) *Education: Culture, economy, and society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wexler, P. 1992. *Becoming Somebody: Toward a social psychology of school*. London Washington DC: The Falmer Press.

Williams, R. 1988. *Keywords*. Glasgow: William Collins.

Williams, R. 1961 (edition.) *The Long Revolution*, London: Chatto and Windus.

Williams, S.J. and Bendelow, G. 1998. (eds.) *Emotions in Social Life: Critical themes and contemporary issues*. London New York.

Willis, P. 1977. *Learning to Labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. Guildford: Gower Publishing Company Limited.

Wolpe, A. 1988. *Within School Walls: The role of discipline, sexuality and the curriculum*. London: Routledge.

Wolff, K.H. 1950. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Woods, P. 1983. *Sociology and The School: An interactionist viewpoint*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Woods, P. 1990a. 'Strategies, Commitment and Identity: Making and breaking the teacher role.' in Woods, P. *Teacher Skills and Strategies*. Lewes: Falmer Press.

Woods, P. 1990b. *The Happiest Days: How pupils cope with schools*. London: Falmer Press.

Worsley, P., (ed. 2nd edition) *Modern Sociology* (1978) Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.

Young, I.M. 1983. 'Is Male Gender Identity the Cause of Male Domination?' in Trebilcot, J. (ed.) *Mothering: Essays in feminist theory*. Savage: Rowman and Littlefield.

Young, R.E. 1989. 'The Modern Educational Crisis' in *A Critical Theory of Education: Habermas and our children's future*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Appendix 1

Copies of Form SC1: Prim, Form SC1: Sec, and Form SC1: Spec, used by the SOEID (1998 -1999) to collect information as part of a yearly census of schools carried out by the Government Statistical Service.

Week starting 14 September 1998

**Primary Schools or Departments
Summary return on pupils and teachers**

Please return by 28 September 1998

Please return to:

The Scottish Office
Education Statistics Division - EDATA
1A West Wing (Delivery Point 27)
Victoria Quay
EDINBURGH EH6 6QQ**Important: Please read Form SC1: Prim completion notes carefully before completing this form.**

School Name _____ School code number

Address _____

Telephone _____ Contact name _____

Section 1: General information about your primary school/department**1.1 Types of Unit for which your school holds budgetary responsibility**

Does your primary school hold budgetary responsibility for any of the following units? If so, please tick the appropriate box(es) and enter the number of pupils attending under the relevant column heading.

	Tick if present	Number of pupils from your school	Number of pupils from other schools
Special Educational Needs Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Behavioural Support Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Gaelic Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Other, please specify <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

1.2 Types of Communal Unit which pupils based at your school attend

Do you have pupils based in your primary school who attend a communal unit of any type funded by an education authority?

Yes ☐ No ☐1.3 If **yes**, please specify which type(s) of unit(s):

1.4 If you have ticked 'Yes' at 1.2 above, please state the total number of pupils from your school that attend the communal unit.

5 Special Educational Needs Unit for which your school has budgetary responsibility

If you have answered 'Yes' to the question on whether you have a Special Educational Needs Unit at **section 1.1** above, please indicate whether you cater for all Special Educational Needs.

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have answered 'Yes' please ignore section 1.6 and go to Section 2.

6 If you have indicated 'No', please tick below the type(s) of Special Educational Needs catered for in the Unit: tick all that apply.

Hearing impairment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visual impairment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Physical or motor impairment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Language or communication disorder	<input type="checkbox"/>
Autistic Spectrum Disorder	<input type="checkbox"/>
Social and emotional difficulties	<input type="checkbox"/>
Moderate learning difficulties	<input type="checkbox"/>
Severe learning difficulties	<input type="checkbox"/>
Profound learning difficulties	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section 2: Pupils based in your primary school/department

Include: all pupils based in your primary school or department who receive day school education during the school week (including those who attend the SEN Unit for which you hold budgetary responsibility);
(a pupil's base school is that where the pupil's name is entered within the register).

1 Pupils by stage

Please enter the numbers of boys and girls in each stage who are based in the mainstream school/department.

P1
P2
P3
P4
P5
P6
P7

Boys			Girls		

2 Pupils based in your school who attend the SEN Unit for which you hold budgetary responsibility

Please enter the number of primary school boys and girls based in your school who attend the SEN Unit (for which you hold budgetary responsibility).

SEN Unit

Boys			Girls		

3 Total roll of your primary school/department

Total

Boys			Girls		

4 Integration of pupils with Special Educational Needs in mainstream classes

Recorded pupils are those pupils with a Record of Needs opened and in force, under the Education (Scotland) Act 1980, as amended. The Educational Psychologist or Education Authority will have advised you if any pupils based at your school have a current Record of Needs.

Non-recorded pupils are all other pupils with special educational needs who are not recorded, including pupils who are undergoing assessment for possible recording but for whom a Record of Needs is not yet in force.

Number of pupils with SEN based in your primary school/department:

	Recorded	Non-recorded
4.1 Whole time in mainstream classes.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
4.2 Up to 1/3 time in SEN unit or base, otherwise in mainstream classes.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
4.3 Between 1/3 and 2/3 time in SEN unit or base, otherwise in mainstream classes.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
4.4 More than 2/3 time in SEN unit or base, but some time in mainstream classes.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
4.5 Whole time in SEN unit or base.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

5 Pupils with a Record of Needs based in your primary school/department or SEN Unit - main difficulty in learning

Please enter the number of pupils with a Record of Needs in each category.

Each pupil with a Record of Needs should be counted once only.

	Boys	Girls
a) Sensory:		
(1) Significant hearing impairment;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(2) Significant visual impairment.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
b) Significant physical or motor impairments.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
c) Significant language and communication disorder.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
d) Autistic Spectrum Disorder.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
e) Social, emotional and behavioural difficulties.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
f) Learning difficulties:		
(1) moderate;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(2) severe;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(3) profound;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(4) specific learning difficulty in language and/or mathematics (including dyslexia).	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
g) Complex or multiple impairments:		
(1) Dual sensory impairment;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(2) Moderate learning difficulties and significant additional impairments or disorders;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(3) Severe learning difficulties and significant additional impairments or disorders;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(4) Profound learning difficulties and significant additional impairments or disorders.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
h) Other		
Please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

6 Normal class sizes of pupils allocated to a stage

Please complete one line for each class (see example in completion notes before completing)

[illegible]

Section 3: Teachers working at your primary school/department

- Include:** ⇒ staff on normal complement, **including** temporary staff;
 ⇒ **either** absentees **or** replacements but **not both**;
 ⇒ staff on the normal complement of the SEN Unit (if there is one).
- Exclude:** ⇒ the FTE of subject specialists spent teaching in other schools;
 ⇒ instructors;
 ⇒ staff based centrally at the education authority not teaching at the school in census week.

1 Teachers working at your primary school by grade, sex and mode of working

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Full-time Number	Part-time Number	Part-time FTE	Full-time Number	Part-time Number	Part-time FTE
Headteacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Deputy Headteacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Assistant Headteacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Senior Teacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Other Promoted Posts	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Teachers (Unpromoted)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Total	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

2 Please enter the **total number** of teachers in your primary school.

3 Please enter the **total FTE** of **all** teachers in your primary school.

4 Please enter **the FTE** of the teachers with a designated remit for making provision for pupils with SEN (This should be included in the total FTE at section 3.3).

Section 4: Non-teaching staff working in your primary school/department

- Include:** ⇒ all non-teaching staff on your normal staffing complement working in your school (including any such staff working in your SEN unit for which you hold budgetary responsibility) such as contracted classroom assistants, including people employed under the Early Intervention Programme, SEN assistants, nursery nurses.
- Exclude:** ⇒ all non-teaching staff engaged wholly in clerical jobs or support service roles outside the classroom/SEN unit, parents assisting on a voluntary basis, caretakers, canteen staff, lunchtime supervisors, janitors, etc.

1 Please enter the **FTE** of the nursery nurses, classroom assistants or other auxiliary staff working in your school.

Please use a separate sheet to record any comments that you have.

I have taken reasonable steps to satisfy myself that this return is accurate.

Headteacher..... Date

Week starting 14 September 1998

Secondary Schools or Departments

Summary return on pupils/students and teachers

Please return by 28 September 1998

Please return to:

The Scottish Office

Education Statistics Division - EDATA

1A West Wing (Delivery Point 27)

Victoria Quay

EDINBURGH EH6 6QQ

Important: Please read Form SC1:Sec completion notes carefully before completing this form.

Name of school

School code number

Address

Telephone number

Contact for enquiries

Section 1: General information about your secondary school/department

1

Types of Unit for which your school holds budgetary responsibility

Does your school hold budgetary responsibility for any of the following units? If so, please tick the appropriate box(es) and enter the number of pupils/students attending under the relevant column heading.

	Tick if present	Number of pupils/students from your school	Number of pupils/students from other schools
Special Educational Needs Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Behavioural Support Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Gaelic Unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Other, please specify <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

2

Types of Communal Unit which pupils/students based at your school attend

Do you have pupils/students based in your secondary school who attend a communal unit of any type funded by an education authority?

Yes

No

3

If yes, please specify which type(s) of unit(s):

4

If you have ticked 'Yes' at 1.2 above, please state the total number of pupils/students from your school that attend the communal unit.

1.5 Special Educational Needs Unit for which your school has budgetary responsibility

If you have answered 'Yes' to the question on whether you have a Special Educational Needs Unit at **section 1.1** above, please indicate whether you cater for all Special Educational Needs.

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have answered 'Yes' please ignore section 1.6 and go to Section 2.

1.6 If you have indicated 'No', please tick below the type(s) of Special Educational Needs catered for in the Unit: tick all that apply.

Hearing impairment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visual impairment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Physical or motor impairment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Language or communication disorder	<input type="checkbox"/>
Autistic Spectrum Disorder	<input type="checkbox"/>
Social and emotional difficulties	<input type="checkbox"/>
Moderate learning difficulties	<input type="checkbox"/>
Severe learning difficulties	<input type="checkbox"/>
Profound learning difficulties	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section 2: Pupils/students based in your secondary school/department

Include:

- ⇒ all pupils/students based in your secondary school or department who receive day school education during the school week (including those who attend the SEN Unit for which you hold budgetary responsibility);
- ⇒ all LINK students;
- ⇒ those on Block Release;
- ⇒ those on Day Release;
- ⇒ adults attending **day education** classes only.

Exclude:

- ⇒ pupils/students whose base is another school, FE College or other institution;
- ⇒ pupils/students who should have entered the first term of S5 because they had not attained the school leaving age at summer in S4, but instead, who are attending full-time FE courses and are not expected to return to school. (Note: These are not LINK students);
- ⇒ adults attending evening classes only.

2.1 Pupils/students (including adults) by stage

Please enter the numbers of males and females in each stage who are based in the mainstream school/department.

	Male			Female		
S1						
S2						
S3						
S4						
S5						
S6						
Aged 19 and over (adults)						

2 Pupils/students based in SEN Unit for which you hold budgetary responsibility

Please enter the numbers of secondary males and females based in your school who attend the SEN Unit (for which you hold budgetary responsibility).

	Male			Female		
SEN Unit						

3 Total roll of your secondary school/department (including adults)

	Male			Female		
Total						

2.4 Integration of pupils/students with Special Educational Needs in mainstream classes

Recorded pupils/students are those pupils/students with a Record of Needs opened and in force, under the Education (Scotland) Act 1980, as amended. The Educational Psychologist or Education Authority will have advised you if any pupils/students based in your school have a current Record of Needs.

Non-recorded pupils/students are all other pupils/students with special educational needs who are not Recorded, including pupils/students who are undergoing assessment for possible recording but for whom a Record of Needs is not yet in force.

Number of pupils/students with SEN based in your secondary school/department:		Recorded	Non-recorded
2.4.1	Whole time in mainstream classes.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2.4.2	Up to 1/3 time in SEN unit or base, otherwise in mainstream classes.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2.4.3	Between 1/3 and 2/3 time in SEN unit or base, mainstream classes otherwise in mainstream classes.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2.4.4	More than 2/3 time in SEN unit or base, but some time in mainstream classes.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2.4.5	Whole time in SEN unit or base.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

2.5 Pupils/Students with a Record of Needs based in your secondary school/department (including those who attend your SEN Unit) - main difficulty in learning

- Please enter the number of **pupils/students** with a Record of Needs in each category.
- Each pupil/student with a Record of Needs should be counted **once only**.

(a) Sensory:	Male	Female
(1) Significant hearing impairment;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(2) Significant visual impairment.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(b) Significant physical or motor impairments.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(c) Significant language and communication disorder.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(d) Autistic Spectrum Disorder.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(e) Social, emotional and behavioural difficulties.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(f) Learning difficulties:		
(1) moderate;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(2) severe;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(3) profound;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(4) specific learning difficulty in language and/or mathematics (including dyslexia).	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(g) Complex or multiple impairments:		
(1) Dual sensory impairment;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(2) Moderate learning difficulties and significant additional impairments or disorders;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(3) Severe learning difficulties and significant additional impairments or disorders;	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(4) Profound learning difficulties and significant additional impairments or disorders.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
(h) Other		
Please specify: <input style="width: 350px;" type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Section 3: Teachers working at your secondary school/department

- Include** ⇒ staff on the normal complement, **including** temporary staff;
 ⇒ **either** absentees **or** replacements **but not both**;
 ⇒ subject and other specialists including, for example, visiting modern language teachers from other secondary schools teaching at the school in census week;
 ⇒ staff on the normal complement of the SEN Unit (if there is one).
- Exclude** ⇒ the FTE of subject specialists spent teaching in other schools;
 ⇒ instructors;
 ⇒ staff based centrally at the education authority not teaching at the school in census week.

3.1 Teachers working at this secondary school by grade, sex and mode of working

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Full-time Number	Part-time Number	Part-time FTE	Full-time Number	Part-time Number	Part-time FTE
Headteacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .
Depute Headteacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .
Assistant Headteacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .
Principal Teacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .
Assistant Principal Teacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .
Senior Teacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .
Other Promoted Posts	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .
Teachers (Unpromoted)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .
Total	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> .

3.2 Please enter the **total number** of teachers in your secondary school.

3.3 Please enter the **total FTE** of **all** teachers in your secondary school.

3.4 Please enter the **FTE** of the teachers with a designated remit for making provision for pupils/students with SEN (This should be included in the total FTE at Section 3.3).

Please use a separate sheet to record any comments you have.

I have taken reasonable steps to satisfy myself that this return is accurate.

Headteacher..... Date

FORM SC1:Spec - SPECIAL SCHOOLS OR DEPARTMENTS

School Census 1998-99

Week starting 14 September 1998

Special Schools or Departments
Summary return on pupils/students and teachers

Please return by 28 September 1998

Please return to:
The Scottish Office
Education Statistics Division - EDATA
1A West Wing (Delivery Point 27)
Victoria Quay
EDINBURGH EH6 6QQ

Important: Please read SC1:Spec completion notes carefully before completing this form.

Name of school _____ School code number

Address _____

Telephone number _____ Contact for enquiries _____

Section 1: General

Length of pupils'/ students' school week

Please enter, in hours, the length of the standard school week for pupils/students at this special school **excluding** breaks for lunch, etc.

Section 2: Teachers working at this special school

Teachers working at this special school by grade, sex and mode of employment

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Full-time Number	Part-time Number	Part-time FTE	Full-time Number	Part-time Number	Part-time FTE
Headteacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Deputy Headteacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Assistant Headteacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Principal Teacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Assistant Principal Teacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Senior Teacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Teacher Promoted Posts	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Teachers (Unpromoted)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Other	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Please enter the **total number** of teachers in your special school.

Please enter the **total FTE** of all teachers in your special school.

Section 3: Non-teaching staff working at this special school

Please enter the **number** of non-teaching staff working at this special school.

Please enter the **FTE** of non-teaching staff working at this special school.

Appendix 11

Transcription Notation: used in both forms of data presentation

...	Pause in speaker's utterance
.....	Pause in speaker's utterance of more than one second
[]	Writer's comment about context
.....	Speaker's utterance trails to a stop
(...)	Speaker's utterance interrupted
CAPITALS	Speaker's utterance is emphasised by an increase in volume, but, not shouted
(.....)	Speaker's utterance unintelligible

Appendix 111

Issues of consent and disclosure

Informed Consent

Author's locate the principle of informed consent as arising out of the Nuremberg war trials, which underlined the voluntary nature of informed consent (Homan 1991: 10; Burgess 1984: 200). Characteristically informed consent is made in conditions free from coercion, where the person involved, is expected to be sufficiently well informed, able to understand questions and able to give an enlightened response. The British Sociological Association (BSA) did not formally deal with professional ethics until 1967; when the impact of ethical considerations upon professional interests in terms of 'knowledge' were considered in relation to interests of 'subjects', sponsors, colleagues, employers/employees, and members of other professions (Burgess 1984).²⁹⁴ As President of the British Educational Research Association, John Elliot's article,²⁹⁵ stimulated debate within educational research, that led to the publication of codes of practice. Ethical considerations in educational research are reflected in two codes of practice, published by BERA (BERA 1992) and in draft form a publication by its Scottish counterpart Scottish Educational Research Association SERA (SERA 1994). The SERA code is designed to defend academic freedom (1994: 4). Both codes show a main focus of concern on the relative power of adult relationships in research, drawing attention to the question of intellectual ownership of research in the context of funded research. The BERA Guidelines comment,

Such a concern must be seen in a context where involvement in funded research is now viewed as a major indicator of the quality of schools and departments of education in higher education, and where central government now controls access to large amounts of funding for research in a field which it increasingly views as its policy domain (BERA 1992: 1).

²⁹⁴ See Burgess for a discussion of ethical questions in relations between professionals, and research participants and its impact upon dissemination and teaching of research findings (1984: 189-194).

²⁹⁵ See John Elliot, 'Towards a Code of Practice for Funded Educational Research' (Research Intelligence, March 1989).

Whilst intellectual ownership and its implications for academic freedom is a central research issue to address, and provides evidence of Barnes arguments above, the focus of the document in effect side lines the issue of informed consent in relation to participant youngsters. For example, whilst point 8 of a 34 point list, addresses the care that should be taken when interviewing children and young people, obtaining participants 'informed consent' is not a stated requirement. The document specifically suggests it would be sufficient to obtain the permission of the school, "and if they so suggest, the parents" (1992: 2) thus parents are informed or consulted at the school's discretion. The fundamental principle of the right of participants to withdraw from a research process is addressed at point 10 in list of 34 points. Similarly the SERA draft guidelines, the rights of young participants are not set out in terms of 'informed consent'. The right of participants to withdraw is referred to at point 11 in a list of 25 points.

In contrast, a code of practice specifically developed by The Centre for the Child and Society, at the University of Glasgow²⁹⁶, which has as its central focus of research concern the prevention of harm to children and all research participants who participate in social research. The code argues that,

Whenever time scales permit, research proposals should be submitted to the university Ethics Committee for Non-clinical Research Involving Human Subjects, for comment (Unpublished Code of Practice).

The code, in line with BERA and SERA codes of practice suggests a researcher in establishing the principles that underpin his/her practice, must be prepared to describe the kind and purpose of their research, why and how they were chosen to take part, and of their right to withdraw from all or part of the research at any time. The code defines children broadly in accordance with the UN Convention as "... anyone under the age of 18 years." In the case of children under 16 all principles specifically include a young person's parents. A central ethical debate that links sociology and social work is the issue of gaining participants 'informed consent' (Alderson 1995; Lansdown 1995). In research with children and young people, sociologists who seek to understand actor's own views of their social experiences meet similar concerns for their participants as those faced by social workers.

²⁹⁶ The Centre for the Child and Society had not formally published this code, to date, a point checked by telephone to the Centre in June 1999.

Ethical discussions about the status of children and young people in social inquiry draw upon two bodies of research; social work and social science. The Centre for the Child and Society's code of practice specifically states, "Researchers should not take on a counselling role, but, may advise where information or assistance can be obtained". Social researchers cannot in principle of practice guarantee **confidentiality**, however they can promise to take all measures to secure the **anonymity** and **privacy** of persons and institutions, but, as the literature clearly indicates there are many examples where the 'cat got out of the bag' (See Burgess).

The question of **confidentiality** in relation to researching with children highlights an important point, researchers are not therapists and must not confuse the purpose of social inquiry with the purpose of social work. However, in practice creating a 'private' if not 'confidential' encounter where participants are able to talk to a relative stranger about potentially difficult experiences one to one, or in a small group, sets up a situation where participants may well take the opportunity to get something 'off their chest'. A researcher is highly likely to be considered a non-player in school relationships, and as such may well become privileged to information which cannot readily be spoken about to school staff. This raises a moral dilemma for a researcher; does he/she tell or treat the information as confidential?

Disclosing sexual abuse

These issues were brought into clear focus by senior staff at Town School and later at City School, who were careful to inform me that I could not promise a pupil to treat what he/she told me as confidential. Sally McNab explained how City School had responded to local authority guidelines²⁹⁷ which clearly state all disclosures of sexual abuse must be acted upon. When talking to pupils about personal or sensitive problems Sally McNab says to them,

...this conversation is private, but, it is not a secret. If there is something that I think needs to be passed on, I'll talk about that with you? (Field notes made at City School).

²⁹⁷ The Guidelines pertaining at the time (which cannot specifically be named for reasons of anonymity) draw upon The Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968; The Police (Scotland) Act 1967; Offences listed in Schedule 1 of the Criminal Procedure (Scotland) Act 1975. Since this time the Children (Scotland) Act 1995 came into force.

A procedure had been set up that was expected to be carried out with discretion. According to this procedure, if a pupil disclosed information about 'abuse' to me then I was obliged to tell the pupil that I would inform the 'designated person', who by law, would act upon the information. I would be required to maintain a point of contact with the pupil as a person to whom they felt able to disclose to. Clearly some research topics may be painful, and potentially this was the case for me as the focus of the research was upon a emotionally charged topic of in/discipline and Exclusion.

Appendix 1V

Questions for teachers in Pilot Study (later called Town School) to 'find' pupils with 'sebd'

15 June 1995

Information about Professional

Code:

Name:

Gender:

Date of first Meeting:

Time:

Place of Meeting:

Profession:

Position:

Information about the Pupils

How many pupils have 'sebd'?, in: (age) Names?

S1: S2: S3: S4:

For each year group, (gender)

How many of these pupils are girls?

How many are boys?

Are there any pupils with 'sebd' who are educated :

i) **Partly out of School and partly in school?** Names?

How many?

Which Year group do they belong to? How many are boys?

How many are girls?

S1: S2: S3: S4:

When in school are these pupils with 'sebd' educated with peers or in separate classes?

What are these classes known as?

ii) Are there pupils with 'sebd' who are educated in school, but, educated separately from their peer group?

How many?

Names?

Which Year group do they belong to? How many are boys?

How many are girls?

S1: S2: S3: S4:

What are these classes known as?

iii) Are there pupils with 'sebd' who are educated partly separately from their peers?

How many?

Names?

Which Year group do they belong to? How many are boys?

How many are girls?

S1: S2: S3: S4:

What are these classes known as?

iv) Would the pupils with 'sebd' that we have identified be generally accepted across the school?

v) Who?

Gender?

What Year?

Expected Standard Grade level for Maths?

English?

vi) Would you be able to assess the class background of individual pupils with 'sebd'?

vii) Would you be able to assess the ethnic background of individual pupils with 'sebd'?

viii) From the above responses we will determine a description which matches the pupils with 'sebd' that emerge from these questions and randomly select a number of pupils fit this description, but, who do not have 'sebd'.

Conclusion This is the first part of the process of selecting pupils for participation in the pilot study. The next step will entail making decisions about whether or not to interview the pupils selected and how to structure the interview, or, to provide a suitable stimulus which will be the focus of a discussion about disturbing and disruptive behaviour of pupils in school.

Appendix V

Selection of Pupils used at Town School and City School

Step 1

- Staff member: Senior Staff with access to **SLG agenda**.
- From the agenda, assign a number to each pupil who is on the agenda (if the number is very small include all pupils who have been on the agenda this academic session)
- Draw the numbers out a hat and note the order in which they were withdrawn.
- Select the first 2 (4 in City School) girls and the first 2 (4 in City School) boys. in order to write to them to invite them to take part in the study.
- Establish each pupil's, age sex, standard grade profile for English and maths. (This aspect of process not carried out at City School) Note that they were selected from the SLG agenda.

Step 2

Staff Member: Guidance for Third Year.

- Go through the same procedure, but selection of names for numbering in this case will be drawn **only** from those pupils who have '**conduct sheets**', in S3. That is, excluding pupils on the SLG agenda and pupils whose behaviour conforms to school norms.
- Draw the numbers out a hat and note the order in which they were withdrawn.
- Select the first 2 (4 in City School) girls and the first 2 (4 in City School) boys.
- Establish each pupil's, age sex, standard grade profile for English and maths. Note that they were selected from the 'conduct sheet' cohort for 3rd Year .

Step 3

Staff Member: School Administrator

- randomly select 2 (4 in City School) boys and 2 (4 in City School) girls from the School year register, excluding pupils who are on the SLG agenda, and, those pupils who are currently using 'conduct sheets'.
- Establish each pupil's, age, sex, standard grade profile for English and maths. Note that they were pupils without 'behavioural difficulties'.

Conclusion.

- In total there will be 12 (24 in City School) pupils selected, but, we need only 6 (12 in City School). When the replies come in it is anticipated that some will not want to participate so rather than start with only 6 (12 in City School) pupils we

can inform those who are not finally selected by letter, thanking them for their interest and explaining why they were not selected.

- School Administrator will send me a list of the pupils names with the information as requested.

Step 4

- After the above selection of pupils, send an amended letter from me accompanied by a letter of endorsement from Head Teacher to each of the 12 (24 in City School) pupils.
- I send the letters to the School Administrator with 12 (24 in City School) stamped envelopes for the school to address and send them out, including 12 (24 in City School) stamped addressed (to me) envelopes, the letter from me and the letter from Head Teacher.
- I then await replies.

Step 5

- Arrange dates to show the video, arrange the video and room for it to be shown. Video will consist of clips from *West Side Story*. and an informal discussion will take place after each clip to discuss the theme which the clip introduces. The themes will be 'behaviour in conflict with authority', 'femininity' and 'masculinity', and finally socio-economic problems. The pupils will be guided to reflect upon their own experiences in relation to school.
- Diaries and Pencils: after the discussion pupils will be given the materials for them to note their thoughts, if they want to, for return to me when they come for interview.
- Arrange return dates for individual interviews.
- Arrange a room to do the interviews.
- Prepare a semi-structured interview schedule to guide this part of the proceedings, derived in part from the taped focus group analysis and the themes that I am exploring.

Appendix V1

Interview Guide for focus group in the Pilot Study (later called Town School and used again for City School focus groups) 30 January 1996.

Introduction

Open the interview by **getting the pupils to introduce themselves to me**. I am a stranger, whereas, they will all have seen each other as they are members of the same year group and may well have been in the same year group for three years.

Explanation about the research

On television and radio last week, a few programmes talked about the number of children and young people who are not allowed to go to school. In 1990-1991, 2,900 pupils in England and Wales were not allowed to go to school. They were excluded from school. In 1996 the estimated number of pupils excluded from schools is 14,000. Boys are three times more likely to be excluded from schools than girls.

What is so worrying to a lot of adults, teachers, parents, members of parliament and perhaps pupils, is the fact that the number of pupils not allowed to go to school is growing so fast that it feels like an explosion. People who work in education want to understand why it is happening.

I think it is important to find out what pupils themselves feel and think and do about difficult behaviour in school. I also want to understand how and in what ways girls' behaviour is different from boys' behaviour.

I have been given a kind of job for three years, to find out what I can about this problem. Of course, I cannot do that without talking to pupils and I would like you to help me with this job.

Any questions?

Reassure pupils that everyone's opinion is of equal value, and that I want to hear everyone's views. Mention that I would like to record the session, but, that no one else will hear the recording, it is just for me to help me remember what was said.

Emphasise we are **not** here to slag anyone off, but, to hear how people feel and what they think, when someone's difficult behaviour stops the class from getting on with their school work.

We are not going to discuss **who** is a bad person, but, **what** we think bad behaviour is. What kinds of behaviour stop people from learning their school work?

We are here to do some work but, hopefully it will be enjoyable. No-one has to say anything that they do not want to say. We should not go out from the group and talk about what people have had to say. There are no right or wrong answers here and we must treat each other's point of view with respect.

I am going to show you a couple of clips from a film called *West Side Story*. Talk a bit about the background of the film. Although the film is not set in Scotland, nor in present day, it is about young people and the difficulties that they find themselves

in when they behave in ways which get them into trouble. The story is about two rival gangs in New York. The boys and the girls in one gang are not allowed to be friends with, or to be in love with, the boys and girls in the other gang. The story is mainly about what happens when a boy and girl fall in love and they don't belong in the same gang. We are not really going to talk about that bit of the story, but, about the difficulties which they all share in growing up and which we see as the love story is told. The difficulties are those which young people experience when growing up, white and poor, or, Puerto Rican and poor, in a rich white society. Also girls and boys have to work out how to be cool, how to behave as girls and how to behave as boys, so that they can belong to the 'gang'. As you will see there is one character who does have difficulties.

So, in the film you will see different styles of dressing and talking and behaving than boys and girls do now. Maybe you might see things that are still the same.

After each bit of film we will talk about what we have seen. I will help you to link up what you feel and think about the film with the problems you may have in school, by asking some questions.

Clip 1: 'behaviour which causes bother'

From 'sharks stink' on the wall to the bit just after the policeman has to say 'please' to Bernardo.

Themes raised:

Behaviour;

- stereotypical masculine behaviour?
- traditional macho masculinity?
- racism and exclusion in relation to communal facilities
- behaviour which conflicts with authority
- gangs being treated differently by authority
- no sense of employment in the gang membership

Questions

Tell me what you felt about the clip?

(Go round the group as tactfully as possible to make sure everyone is able to say something)

where was the scene set?

which characters did you notice?

what did you notice about them?

were the characters happy?

do you think that boys behave like that now?

when boys get into trouble, what sort of things are they told off about?

do you think that girls behave in the same way as boys?

when girls get into trouble, what sort of things are they told off about?

group loyalty : gangs seemed to suspend their fight with each other whilst the police are present.

do you think the police treated the gang members in the same way

do you think teachers treat pupils differently

do women teachers treat boys differently to girls?

do male teachers treat boys differently to girls?

do you think pupils stick together against teachers?

do you think pupils stick together against other adults in the school?

Clip 2 "how do we find out how to behave , as a girl? as a boy?

From: Dress shop which is partly located in the private sphere and partly in the public sphere.

Themes raised:

- female sexuality and its central role in securing a place in the gang
- female community and solidarity, but,
- on condition of falling in love with "...one of your own kind, stick to your own kind".
- role of employment in women's lives.
- clothes to fit the part

No sense of 'jets' women except the tom-boy, rejection of femininity (should I show a bit of that?) and bum slapping to get women to behave.

In the clip the women were talking about what they were going to wear to an important social event. They were going to dance, and they seemed to have rules about what to wear, and who to go to the dance with. The two women talked about clothes for praying in, and clothes for dancing in.

General Questions about the content of the film clip

how they feel?

how they think/know?

what they do?

Questions about school experience

I know you wear school uniforms, but, do you think about the way you dress?

does the way you dress in school ever cause problems?

are there ways in which boys might be allowed to dress and girls not allowed to dress?

are you happy with the style that your uniform allows?

do you ever think that the way a boy dresses can get him into trouble?

do you think the way a girl dresses can get her into trouble?

Do teachers bother about the way that you dress?

Clip 3 'how do people end up being called bad?

From: 'tom boy' jumping into the group of boys who then are hassled by Officer Krupke. The clip fades out as the song *Officer Krupke* begins. Editing decisions were made because the dialogue which preceded it drew out the preceding themes which have run through the clips, as well as making the points about becoming 'bad' and the various explanations for the identity. The clip is essentially chosen to try to get at whether or not the pupils can draw a distinction between an identity and roles as well as processes of becoming labelled as 'bad'.

Themes raised:

labelling of character (not presented quite so up front as in the song) by the police, the judge, the social worker

Each offer an explanation as to why the character behaves in ways which do not fit with existing social norms.

General Questions about the content of the film clip

how they feel?

how they think/know?

what they do?

do you think there is something wrong with the characters?

do you think they are 'bad' people?

do you think there are other reasons why they get into trouble?

Questions to help pupils reflect on possible connections with their own experience of 'in trouble'

when there is trouble in the classroom or around the school do you talk about it?

whom do you talk to?

do you talk in groups?

do you only talk to one person?

will the person you talk to be the same sex as you?

do you think there is any difference in what teachers think is bad behaviour, and what you think is bad behaviour?

can you describe to me what you think is bad behaviour

Appendix V11

Pupil interview guide: created from transcription and analysis of Town School focus group interview with minor **amendments**, made on 10 June 1996, in **bold type**.

Name: Sex: Date of Birth:

Family/ Home Life:

do you live with your parents?

do you have any brothers or sisters?

are they living with you?

are there other relatives that you see, grandparents?

how do you travel to school?

are you entitled to a free school meal?

School:

have you always attended this High School since S1?

Other Schools:

how many?

which schools were they?

tell me why you moved schools?

describe the events of your move?

who was involved in the decisions that were made at the time?

Expected Educational Attainment:

Standard Grade ;

English:

Maths:

What Else?

Have your teachers changed during the school year?

Did the change bother you?

Were you glad about the change?

Feelings about formal aspects of school.

do you enjoy your school work?

what subjects do you prefer?

can you understand what work have to do in each class?

are there subjects where you find the work difficult?

can you get help when you find your school work difficult to do?

do those around you in the class enjoy their school work?

do you find the preparation of folio work stressful?

or difficult to understand how to do it?

do you prefer a female teacher, a male teacher, or do you not mind at all?

Social Aspect of School:

do you enjoy the social side of school?

do you have enough time to talk to other pupils?

do you talk mainly to boys or girls?

describe what you think 'social exclusion' means?

do you think that some pupils are socially excluded?

Attendance, Absence and Exclusion

do you ever decide not to come to school?

what do you do instead?

do you meet up with friends from this school, or other schools?

do you ever get sent home because of bad behaviour in classroom or the school?

Issues Arising from the Focus Group. (amended on the 10 June after two interviews in Main Study (renamed City School) and reflection upon observation of pupils in classroom and the environs of the school

'bad behaviour' describe what you mean by this word.

girls boys how would you describe their 'bad' behaviour??

do teachers 'behave badly'?

do female teachers 'behave badly'?

do male teachers 'behave badly'?

'talking' describe what you mean by this word.

talking about school work and talking about other things

girls boys do they 'talk' in different ways?

do teachers 'talk'?

do female teachers 'talk'?

do male teachers 'talk'?

'reputation' describe what you mean by this word.

girls boys do they have different sorts of reputations?

do teachers have a 'reputation'?

describe the kinds of 'reputations' of female teachers ?

describe the kinds of 'reputations' of male teachers?

Where do you think the bad reputations come from?

teachers?

other pupils?

'exclusions' what does 'excluded' mean to you?

suspension? expulsion?

have you ever been 'excluded' from school?

how many times?

for how long?

if you are excluded from the classroom, where do you have to go?

outside the classroom door?

to a special classroom?

do you take your work with you?

are you sent home because of bad behaviour?

who do you think excludes a pupil?

teachers, the head teacher, the guidance staff?

have any of your pals been excluded?

have you heard of pupils not being allowed back into the school at all?

**do you think girls are excluded as often as boys are
excluded?**

- 'fighting' describe what you mean by this word.
 girls boys do they 'fight' in different ways?
 do teachers 'fight'?
 do female teachers 'fight'?"
 do male teachers 'fight'?"
- 'stirring' describe what you mean by this word.
 girls boys do they 'stirr' in different ways?
 do teachers 'stirr'?
 do female teachers 'stirr'?
 do male teachers 'stirr'?"
- 'moaning' describe what you mean by this word.
 girls boys do they 'moan' in different ways?
 do teachers 'moan'?
 do female teachers 'moan'?
 do male teachers 'moan'?"

Experience of Being in Trouble

do you ever get into trouble in the classroom?

any particular subject?

do you ever have to do a punishment exercise?

do you ever have to keep a behaviour sheet, and take it to each class teacher you have in the day?

do you ever get sent out of the classroom?

where do you go?

what do you do?

do you think that your bad behaviour is your problem?

are you able to talk about your problems in private?

do think that you are able to try out different ways of solving those problems?

do you think that teachers find it difficult to help you with your problems?

do you think teachers are able to help you with your problems?

in what ways do you think they can help you?

are you happy to come to school?

is school a happy place?

why do you think you have to come to school?

if you think about the future, do you imagine what you would like to do?

If you could change anything in the classrooms, or, roundabout the school to make it easier what would it be?

Appendix V111**Research on 'difficult behaviour' in Schools Reply Form**

Please print your name here:

Please tick yes or no:

I agree to be interviewed (pupil)	Yes	No
-----------------------------------	-----	----

I agree that my child can be interviewed (parent)	Yes	No
---	-----	----

Please ask your parent or carer to sign here:

Return in the stamped addressed envelope provided to,
Pauline Padfield
Department of Sociology
University of Edinburgh
18 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh
EH8 9LN

Dear

I am a student at Edinburgh University, where I am studying and researching 'behaviour' in schools. I want to find out what pupils think about behaviour problems in school. I wonder if you would be prepared to help me by talking to me about the topic?

The research would be carried out in school. I would need your consent, and your parent's or carer's permission. To help you make up your mind, turn to the attached description about how the research will be done.

If you want to talk to me, here is what to do.

- show this letter to your parents or carers, and
 - fill in the reply slip attached to this letter
 - send it back to me in the envelope provided, as soon as possible.
- Should you agree to talk to me, I will contact you through the school, to arrange a date that suits you.

Thank you for your time.

Yours sincerely,

Pauline Padfield

Pupil Information

How the research will be done

- A date will be arranged for a group of six pupils to meet together, with me, in the school, in a room which the school will arrange.
- I will show three short video clips from a film. We will talk about each clip to discuss the theme that the clip introduces.
- There will be three themes: 'behaviour which cause bother', how do we know how to behave as a girl (to be feminine) or as a boy (to be masculine), and finally 'how do people end up being called bad?'
- We will talk a little bit about these themes so that I can hear how you talk about them. We would take about an hour to talk about these things.
- After the discussion, I will give you a note-pad and a pencil. If you want to, you can write down anything that comes to your mind after the discussion. I will come back to the school at a later date when you can return them to me.
- I will be in the school during the terms when I plan to observe how learning takes place in some of your classes.
- For the last bit, which should take about half an hour or so, I will talk to you on your own. I will have some questions, which I will show you before we start. The interview will take place in the school in a room that the school will arrange.
- If you want to stop at any time that will be okay.

Pupil Information re their subjects and class teachers**Name of pupil:****Name of form teacher:****Name of English teacher:****Name of Maths teacher:****Class you enjoy****Name of subject:****Name of teacher:****Class you do not enjoy:****Name of subject:****Name of teacher:**

Appendix VX

Letter to teachers at City School

Pupils' perceptions of 'behavioural difficulties'

1 May 1996

Dear

I am writing to ask for your help in the above research project. The material enclosed provides some explanation about a piece of research, which I have been given official permission to carry out in this school.

The research began today, with five pupils. Next week I hope to make contact with the remaining seven, making a total of twelve pupils. Part of that research would entail spending some time in classes of these twelve pupils.

Meanwhile I am writing to ask you if you would have any objection in principle to my 'sitting in' on a class to see how the pupil relates to his/her learning and how he/she gets along with classmates. I need to draw up a timetable so that I can let you know which pupil and the date of the lesson.

Perhaps you could leave a note with the receptionist to indicate yes or no? I will be in the school next Wednesday morning and would be more than happy to meet you, perhaps at lunch time, if you would like to know more details.

Yours sincerely,

Pauline Padfield

Appendix X

City School Teacher Interview Guide: October 1996

Date of meeting:

Professional Position :

What topics does the teacher teach?.

Name Sex, Date of Birth,

Length of service, How many schools? Why changed? Personal or professional?

1 types of Action (behaviour)

With the focus upon last years S3 and this years S4,

What types of actions/attitudes trigger problems in the class?

What are the characteristics of actions/attitudes that cause problems?

Do boys typically act/ or have such attitudes more than girls?

Do girls act in ways that are different to boys?

Do girls have attitudes that are different to boys?

How do you develop working relationships with boys?

Boy who had a sheet marked?

How do you develop working relationships with girls? for example,

(name pupils included in the study)

Role of sheets in the management of pupil absence, poor conduct in the classroom, and poor achievement with school work?

2 Can you tell me how pupils are excluded from school?

Can you describe the process and illustrate it with a known example?

Can you tell me why boys are excluded from school? For example?

Can you tell me why girls are excluded from school? For example?

What were the events that led up to the exclusion?

Was there a 'big' incident or were there a number of persistent low grade disruptions of the learning process? What role do the outlined school rules play in the day to day management of unacceptable behaviour?

Are they negotiable?

3 Tell me a little about your **experience of teaching**?

What classes do you enjoy teaching?

Do you ever feel under threat from the boys?

Do you ever feel under threat from the girls?

Can you tell me about YUFFTY classes?

Can you tell me a bit about the different roles that you have to play in the school?
Are they negotiable?

4 Tell me a bit about what pupils 'have to learn'. (**structural organisation of pedagogic purpose of schooling**)

Can you tell me a bit about setting?

Do you think the system of F/G and G/C is flexible enough for pupils to be able to transfer from one level to another?

Have you experience of pupils doing that?

Can you tell me a bit about the learning base and your perception of the role it plays in supporting pupils in their learning?

Where do you get information about changes in policies?

Do you have any input into these changes at the school level? at policy level?

5 Resources, physical and material resources.

Are they adequate to the task you are expected to carry out?

6 Pupil Profiles (**opinions** of pupils)

How are they constructed?

Where or from whom do you get information about pupils?

What kinds of opinions are formed at this point? in relation to their personalities?
in relation to their learning abilities?

How do you classroom teachers formulate their opinions of pupils?

7 Pupil Reputations (**kinds of**)

Do teachers know about how pupils talk about each other?

What kinds of reputations do pupils talk about?

Do you know which pupils are thought to be 'trouble makers' or 'model pupils' before they come to the school?

How much information is given to teachers about pupils who may potentially experience difficulties of any kind?

8 Any questions you want to ask me?

Appendix X1

Interview Guide for (discipline) and (guidance) teachers: October 1996

Date of meeting: Professional Position : what topics does the teacher teach.

Name, Sex, Date of Birth

Length of service, How many schools? Why changed? Personal or professional?

1 Pupil Profiles (opinion of pupils)

How are they constructed?

Where or from whom do you get information about pupils?

What kinds of opinions are formed at this point? in relation to their personalities?
in relation to their learning abilities?

How do classroom teachers formulate their opinions of pupils?

Are they prepared in any way for pupils who are potentially going to find school life more difficult to negotiate than the majority of pupils?

2 How does the discipline system work?

How is the discipline system structured?

From the perspective of a classroom or school incident which triggers the call to the discipline system, how does it work?

What are the procedures?

What are the mechanisms?

Who are the staff members who participate in the process?

At what point are parents included in the schools concern about a pupil?

How are they included?

How are pupils themselves included?

What opportunities do they have for participating in the discussion about what they have done?

3 How does the guidance system work?

How is the discipline system structured?

From the perspective of a classroom or school incident which triggers the call to the discipline system, how does it work?

What are the procedures?

What are the mechanisms?

Who are the staff members who participate in the process?

At what point are parents included in the schools concern about a pupil?

How are they included?

How are pupils themselves included?

What opportunities do they have for participating in the discussion about what they have done?

How are changes in either of these systems negotiated and with whom?

4 Can you tell me how pupils are excluded from school?

Can you describe the process and illustrate it with a known example?

Can you tell me why boys are excluded from school? For example?

Can you tell me why girls are excluded from school? For example?

What were the events that led up to the exclusion?

Was there a 'big' incident or were there a number of persistent low grade disruptions of the learning process? What role do the expressed school rules (on the walls of every classroom and teaching and learning space) play in the day to day management of unacceptable behaviour?

Are they negotiable?

5 Tell me a little about your experience of teaching?

What classes do you enjoy teaching?

Do you ever feel under threat from the boys?

Do you ever feel under threat from the girls?

Can you tell me about YUFFTY classes?

Can you tell me a bit about the different roles that you have to play in the school?
Are they negotiable?

Can you tell me a bit about setting?

Can you tell me a bit about the learning base and your perception of the role it plays in supporting pupils in their learning?

6 Any questions you want to ask me?